A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF ANCIENT Church-Government,

WITH A

REFLECTION

On several Modern Writings

OF THE

PRESBYTERIANS,

[*The Assembly of Divines their* Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani, *Published* 1654.

AND

D. Blondel's *Apologia pro Sententia* Hieronymi, *and Others,*]

Touching this Subject.

In TESTIMONIUM, *Illis.* Mat. 10. 18.

The Second Edition.

LONDON,

Printed for *Benj. Tooke*, at the *Ship* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXV.

SIR,

IN Reviewing my Diſcourſe I perceive it ſwelled to a much greater Bulk, than at firſt I intended it; (though, to avoid this, I have uſed a very ſhort, and contracted, and, I fear, ſometimes, obſcure ſtile; and alſo, as knowing to whom I write, purpoſely forborn all Deſcant, and Aggravations, and raiſing Tempeſts in the Paſſions). To eaſe You, then, of ſome of the trouble, to which I have put my ſelf, I thought fit to preadvertiſe you; That, if you chiefly deſire to inform your ſelf concerning the State of *Epiſcopacy* after the *Apoſtle's* times, you may paſs over the firſt

Part of this Diſcourſe, and go on to the ſecond, beginning at *Sect.* 40. Or perhaps, if you deſire only to view the Plea of the Presbyterians againſt *Epiſcopacy*, and what is anſwered thereto, you may alſo paſs over the ſecond Part, and begin with the Third at *Sect.* 71. (only thus much you and I ſhall ſuffer by it, that, without the reading of the former parts of the Diſcourſe, which prepare the way, the latter cannot be ſo clearly underſtood). Again, having obſerved my ſelf to have uſed perhaps ſome over-diligence in not only citing *Fathers* and *Councils*, but moſtwhat inſerting their Words, (which I did, becauſe you might either want ſome of the Books, or leiſure to ſearch them), I have therefore frequently incloſed

theſe

these Quotations, and separated them from the Context, with these two Hooks [ ]: that, where you think the matter so clear, as that to you there need no further Proofs or Instances, to confirm, or illustrate it, you may receive no more hindrance from these interposed Comments, than only to remove your eye to the next Section.

PART I.

The *Apoſtles* the Suceſſors of *Chriſt.*

JESUS Chriſt *the great, and firſt,* Apoſtle *of the Evangelical Profeſſion.* §. 1. Chap. 1.
Ordained, and anointed to this Office by God, *his* Father. §. 2.
Some Particulars of his Apoſtolical *Office.* §. 3. *n.* 1.
1. *Sent to expound the former Law.* §. 3. *n.* 1.
2. *To preach a new Goſpel.* §. 3. *n.* 2.
3. *Endued with Power,* * *to remit and abſolve from former Sins, and admit men into the Covenant of Grace, and Kingdom of Heaven.* §. 3. *n.* 3.
4. * *To confer the* Holy Ghoſt. §. 3. *n.* 4. *And;*
For theſe ends, * *to inſtitute new Sacraments.* §. 3. *n.* 5.

Having fulfilled his Miniſtry, and ſuffered Martyrdom for the Truth, when he was to depart hence, Ordaining others in the ſame Office. §. 5. Chap. 2.
Transferring his Miſſion and Unction upon them. §. 6.
1. *Giving them Authority to preach the Goſpel.* §. 7.
2. *To decide Controverſies, and enact Eccleſiaſtical Laws.* §. 8.
3. *Giving to them the Keys of Heaven, to remit, and to retain Sin, and to adminiſter the Holy* Sacraments. §. 9.
4. *To make publick Interceſſions.* §. 10.
1. *By Prayer.*
2. *And by the Evangelical* Sacrifice.
5. *To theſe ends, Inſpiring them with the Holy Ghoſt.* §. 11. *n.* 1. *And,*

6. *Giving them power to minister the* Holy Spirit *to others.* §. 11. *n.* 2.

Chap. 3. *Delegating his Authority, and Office, not with an exact parity to all.* §. 12. *n.* 1.
But the Twelve *Disciples advanced to higher Dignity and employments, than the Seventy two.* §. 12. *n.* 2.
As; for Confirmation. §. 13.
And for Ordination. §. 14.
Again: amongst the Twelve, Peter, James, *and* John, *advanced above the other Nine.* §. 19.
And again: Peter *advanced to an higher Dignity than the other Eleven.* §. 20.;
Shewed, from Scriptures; and Fathers. §. 20, 21, 22.
The disparity of Church-men under the Gospel *being suitable to that under the* Law. §. 24.

Chap. 4. Christ *sending, as the Apostles, so others their Successors unto the end of the World.* §. 35.
Christ assisting, as the Apostles, so their Successors to the end of the World. §. 36. *n.* 1.

Chap. 5. *The Apostles, before their departure, according to our Lord's Institution, transferring their Commission on others.* §. 37.
Ordaining these with Prayer and Imposition of hands. §. 37.
Some Particulars of the Authority transmitted unto them. §. 38.
Their *Function, as the* Apostle's, *of* Divine *Institution.* §. 39.

PART II.

Bishops the Successors of the *Apostles*.

Chap. 1. THis *Authority distributed to others by the* Apostles, *not with an exact Parity.* §. 40.
But one Presbyter in every Church, advanced over all the rest. §. 41.

Catalogues

Catalogues of the Biſhops *of ſeveral Churches, in, and immediately after, the* Apoſtle's *days.* §. 42. *n.* 1.

That theſe Biſhops *were expreſſed to be ſuperior to the other* Presbyters, *not only in Precedency or Dignity, but in Office and Authority, by the Writers of thoſe firſt times.* §. 44. *n.* 1. Chap. 2.

That the Biſhops *of the following Ages (who are granted, by all, ſuperior in* Authority *to* Presbyters) *were held to be, of our* Lord's, *or of* Apoſtolical Inſtitution, *and Succeſſion, by the* Fathers *of thoſe times.* §. 52. Chap. 3.

That there were alſo Metropolitans *ſuperior to other* Biſhops, *either in, or ſoon after, the* Apoſtles *times, teſtified by the* Fathers. §. 61.

The ſuperior Authority of the ancient Biſhops *to* Presbyters *ſhewed in ſeveral Particulars.* §. 62. Chap. 4.

1. Presbyters, *not to exerciſe any Eccleſiaſtical Function without the* Biſhop's *Licence.* §. 63. *n.* 1.
2. *Not to exerciſe ſome Eccleſiaſtical Functions at all.* §. 64.

Amongſt others theſe four proper to the Biſhop.

1. *Ordination.* §. 65. *n.* 1. Chap. 5.

2. *Conſignation, or Confirmation.* §. 66. *n.* 1. Chap. 6.

3. *Forenſick Judicature, and inflicting Cenſures.* §. 69. *n.* 1. Chap. 7.

4. *Diſpoſal of the Church's revenue.* §. 70.

PART

PART III.

The Presbyterian's Plea againſt *Biſhops*.

Chap. 1. EPiſcopacy *anciently oppoſed by* Aerius. §. 71.
Of late by the Presbyterians. §. 72.
Their Conceſſions.
1. Timothy's *and* Titus *his Authority ſuperior to Presbyters.* §. 73. *n.* 1.
2. *Not expiring with their Perſons, but to be continued in the Church.* §. 74. *n.* 1.
3. *Found, before the middle of the ſecond Age, in the Poſſeſſion of* ſingle *Perſons ſuperior to Presbyters.* §. 75. *n.* 1.
4. *A* Prime Presbyter *having a preſidency over the reſt, found in the* Apoſtle's *times, and thoſe immediately following.* §. 76.

Chap. 2. Their Aſſertion.
A Prime Presbyter *or* Biſhop *denied to have had any ſingular Power of, Ordination, exerciſing Cenſures, &c. before* A. D. 140. §. 81.
Their Arguments out of the Scriptures.
That (*there*) Biſhop *and* Presbyter *ſignifie the ſame.* §. 82.
That both ſignifie, not the modern Biſhop, *but* Presbyter. §. 84. *n.* 1.
That Timothy *and* Titus *their Office was extraordinary, occaſional, unfixt.* §. 85. *n.* 1.

Chap. 3. *Their Arguments out of the* Fathers. §. 86.

Chap. 4. *Their Arguments, in particular, concerning Presbyterial Ordination, that it was anciently, allowed, practiſed.* §. 94. *n.* 1.

PART

PART IV.

An Answer to this their Plea.

Before which; a Review of their Concessions. §. 96. Chap. 1.

And some other Concessions (to remove by-quarrels) made to them. §. 100. Chap. 2.

Particular Replies *to their particular* Objections. Chap. 3.

R. to their Objections out of the Scriptures. §. 105, *&c.*
Where
Concerning S. Paul's *return from* Rome *into the East.* §. 112.
Concerning Timothy's *fixt Government in the Church of* Ephesus, *or of the* Proconsular Asia, §. 118.
Concerning Timothy *and* Titus *their residence.* §. 124.

R. to their Objections out of the Fathers. §. 128, *&c.* Chap. 4.
Where
Concerning S. Jerom's *touching* Episcopacy. §. 131. *see likewise* §. 42. *n.* 2. *&c.* ——— §. 60. §. 76. *n.* 2. ——§. 155. *n.* 8.
Concerning Hilarius *his* Primus Presbyter. §. 136. *See likewise* §. 76. *n.* 1. —— §. 57.
Concerning Aerianism §. 154. *see likewise* §. 71.

R. to their Objections concerning Presbyterial Ordination anciently practised. §. 156, *&c.* Chap. 5.
Where
Concerning some of the Episcopal *Party's conceding a Power of Ordination to* Presbyters *in case of* necessity. §. 156.

And

And concerning the ſeveral pretended caſes of neceſſity; *and concerning the non-falling away of all* Biſhops *in the Church* §. 159. *&c.* (*of which ſee alſo* §. 136. *n.* 2.)— *and, that the Apologies of theſe* Epiſcopal Divines *nothing relieve the* Presbyterian *Caſe.* §. 163, 164.

Concerning Chorepiſcopal *Ordinations.* §. 171, *&c. ſee likewiſe* §. 65. *n.* 7.

Concerning D. Blondel's *Inſtances of ancient* Presbyter's *Ordinations of* Presbyters. §. 173, *&c.*

Concerning the Power of abrogating Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution. §. 177.

Concerning ſome of the Roman *Writer's aſſerting that* Presbyters *may ordain* Presbyters, *if licenſed by the* Pope. §. 183. *n.* 2. *&c.*

Concerning the compariſon of Presbyters *ordaining with* Presbyters *Confirming, and* Lay-mens *Baptizing,* §. 184. *to* 188.

Chap. 6. *Concluſion, reflecting on the whole Diſcourſe.* §. 194.

SIR,

SIR,

THough you have enjoined me (only) to send you a compendious Narration of what is said by the Presbyterians *(especially out of their lateſt Writings) againſt* Epiſcopacy; *and what, on the other ſide, (eſpecially out of the Scriptures, and prime Antiquity) is alledged for it: yet I beg your leave to begin my Diſcourſe ſomewhat higher; to ſhew you (but with all poſſible brevity) the firſt Original of this Evangelical* Hierarchy. *That ſo, not only a deeper and ſurer foundation may be laid for the ſupport of what we ſhall build thereupon in this preſent Controverſie, but alſo a greater reverence and obſervance may be excited in us toward theſe Succeſſors of our great Lord here on Earth; to whom, at his departure hence, he committed, till his ſecond coming, the Government of his Church; and whoſe power, armed only with a ſpiritual Sword, (the wounds of which are felt chiefly in the next World, and ſo are leſs dreaded by this) and ſupported moſt-what with a mean temporal Fortune, yet hath ſtood hitherto againſt all oppoſition, and ſhall ſtand for ever.*

Part I.

CHAP. I.

§. 1.

Jeſus Chriſt the great and firſt *Apoſtle* of the Evangelical profeſſion.

AFter (then) that two thouſand years of the World's age had been run out under the Law of Nature, and Traditions unwritten, and, near other two thouſand under the Law written; toward the Evening thereof, the Lord *Chriſt Jeſus*, the only Son of God, was ſent by his Father; * a new and perfect

Law-giver, (*Heb.* 3.2.–*Jo.* 13.34.–*Matt.* 5.28.) being Maſter of the houſe, wherein *Moſes* was a Servant; * the great and laſt *Prophet*, to whom *Moſes* referred the World (*Deut.* 18.15) * the *Apoſtle* of a new profeſſion (*Heb.* 3 1.) * the great *Shepherd and Paſtor* (*Heb.* 13. 20.) Paſtor and *Biſhop* (1 *Pet.* 2. 25.) ὁ διδάσκαλος (*Jo.* 13.13.–3.2.) and διάκονος (*Rom.* 15.8.) * ſent, in this quality, out of his Father's boſome (*Jo.* 1. 18.) as he, who only perfectly knew the Father, and in whom were hid all the treaſures of wiſdome and knowledge (*Col.* 2. 3.) to compleat now what was formerly unfiniſhed; and fully to reveal, and make known unto the World the whole Will and Counſel of the Father, concerning its perfect Sanctification and Salvation.

§. 2. And for this Office, ſince none, uncalled to it, may take ſuch honour (*Heb.* 5 4) he was firſt *anointed* and *ſealed* by God (*Acts* 4. 27.–*Luke* 4. 18, 22.–*Iſai.* 11. 2. *Acts* 10.38.) *anointed* with the Holy Ghoſt, and with power; and that viſibly, at his Baptiſm, (when arrived to the uſual age of officiating in holy things, *Numb.* 4.) by the deſcent of the Spirit in the ſimilitude of a Dove; and by the Father's vocal Declaration from Heaven (*Matt.* 3. 16, 17.) of his Miſſion, that all the People might know him to be ſent: *anointed* with the fulneſs of the Holy Ghoſt, which never Man was before him: *For it pleaſed the Father, that in him all fulneſs ſhould dwell* (Col. 1. 19, &c.) *and God gave not the Spirit, by meaſure, unto him* (Jo. 3. 34.) but, according to meaſure, he giveth it to all men elſe (Eph. 4. 7.).

Ordained and anointed to this Office by *God* his *Father*.

§. 3. *n.* 1. Having ſeen his Miſſion; now, to conſider ſome particulars of this our Saviour's *Apoſtolical* Office, 1. Firſt he was ſent, in ſome ſenſe, * to preach the Law; which was hitherto either not ſo perfectly taught; or not ſo perfectly underſtood: * to ſhew the accompliſhment in himſelf, and ſo the abrogation, of the Typical and *Ceremonial* Law; * to declare the full extent, and rectifie the miſ-underſtanding, of the *Moral*: and * to require a performance of ſtricter obedience thereto, denouncing, now plainly,

Some particulars of his *Apoſtolical* Office.

1.

Sent 1 * to expound the former *Law*.

plainly, heavier judgments (Hell-fire) to the Tranſgreſſors, and promiſing higher rewards (the Kingdom of Heaven) to the obedient. (See for theſe things *Matt.* 3. and 5. Chapters).

§. 3. *n.* 2.

2. But, beſides this, (which looks like *Moſes* his Office) the miniſtration of the Letter, condemning; he was ſent with the miniſtration of the Spirit, giving life (2 *Cor.* 3.). He was ſent therefore not only to expound the old, but to deliver, from the Father, a new meſſage; to preach the word of reconciliation, (2 *Cor.* 5. 19.) to bring Life and Immortality to light; to reveal the great myſtery of Salvation, * which God indeed had decreed from all eternity; and ſhadowed under Types to all former Ages; and darkly foretold by the Prophets: but, as to any open manifeſtation thereof, * which God had kept ſecret from the beginning of the World, (*Rom.* 16. 25.) and had hid from former Generations (*Col.* 1. 16.) till this Man's preaching thereof; notwithſtanding ſo great longing after it, not only of ſo many Prophets, and righteous Men, but even of the Angels themſelves (ſee *Matt.* 13. 17.--1 *Pet.* 1. 10, 11.--*Eph.* 3. 9.--*Matt.* 11. 11.--1 *Cor.* 2. 9.) to preach the Goſpel to the Poor, deliverance to the Captives; now the acceptable year of the Lord; peace to the World, and God's good-will toward Men; the fulfilling of the long-expected promiſe of God to the *Jews*; and the communicating of his new mercy to the *Gentiles*; (See *Luke* 4. 18, 19. --*Acts* 10. 36.--*Luke* 1. 79.--*Rom.* 15. 8, 9.) Of all which as he was to be the Actor, and all this to be performed to the World through, and by himſelf: ſo was he (the Truth of God) ordained to be the Teacher alſo: Ordained to be both the Preacher, and the Text and Subject preached on (*Pſal.* 40. 9, 10.--2. 7.) becauſe none could ſee that light, but by that light ſhewing it ſelf unto them, (*Jo.* 1. 9, 18.) And this his Commiſſion he juſtified to the *Jews*, who much ſtumbled at this his Preaching, that in it he ſhould bear record of himſelf, and, as the Truth, preach himſelf, as the Life; he juſtified his Commiſſion, I ſay, * by the Witneſs, of the Prophets, of the *Baptiſt*, of

2.
2 *To preach a new *Goſpel*.

his *Father* ſpeaking to them from Heaven; and * by his Miracles.

§. 3. *n.* 3.

3. And, as this Apoſtle was ſent to preach the Goſpel; ſo he received power from the *Father*, to remit, and abſolve from Sin, (*Matt.* 9. 2, 6, 8.) to juſtifie the ungodly, (*Rom.* 4. 5.--*Acts* 5. 31.) and to make Sons of God, (*Jo.* 1. 12.) and to admit into the Church, and into the Kingdom of Heaven, all thoſe, who repented, *i. e.* confeſſed their ſins (*Matt.* 3. 6.), and who promiſed amendment of life, (*Matt.* 3. 8.) and who believed in him, that he was the Son of God, the Truth, and laſt Teacher ſent from God; and who rejected not the Counſel of God ſent to them by him (*Jo.* 3. 18.---5. 24.---8. 31.--12. 48. --*Luke* 7. 30.--*Acts* 8. 37.--19. 4.). In which reſpect alſo he is ſaid to give eternal Life to as many, as receive him, (*Jo.* 17. 3.) to have all judgment committed unto him, (*Jo.* 5. 22.) to have the Key of *David*, as the chief Oeconomiſt and Officer in this houſe, opening and ſhutting, as, and to whom, he pleaſeth (*Rev.* 3. 7.--1. 18.--*Iſa.* 22. 22.).

3. * Endowed with power to remit, and abſolve, from former Sins, and admit Men into the Covenant of Grace, and Kingdom of Heaven.

§. 3. *n.* 4.

4. Yet further; for the effecting of all theſe things, He received power from the Father to give the *Holy Ghoſt*. Therefore the *Baptiſt*, his fore-runner, declared this more ſpecially of him; That He, that followed him, was one, that ſhould Baptize with the *Holy Ghoſt*. (ſee *Matt.* 3. 11. compared with *Acts* 1. 5.) And God the Father (again) revealed this ſame thing, before, to the *Baptiſt*;--That He, on whom *John* ſhould ſee the Spirit deſcending and remaining on Him (foretold *Eſai.* 42. 1.), ſhould Baptize Men with the *Holy Ghoſt*, (*i. e.*) confer the *Holy Ghoſt* on the believing World: and therefore is his Goſpel called the Miniſtration of the *Spirit*, regenerating and ſanctifying the World, and enabling Man to yield Obedience to God's commands, and ſealing the new Converts unto glory (*Matt.* 3. 11.--*Acts* 2. 33, 38.--*Eph.* 4. 7.--*Gal.* 3. 2, 5.--2 *Cor.* 3. 8.).

4. * To confer the *Holy Ghoſt*.

§. 3. *n* 5.

5ly. For the ſignifying, and alſo conveying of which effects, he inſtituted, and uſed the two holy Ceremonies of *Baptiſm*, and the *Euchariſt*; Himſelf adminiſtring the Euchariſt,

5. * And for theſe ends, to inſtitute new *Sacraments*.

Euchariſt, *Matt.*26.26.–*Luke* 24. 30, 35. but baptizing ordinarily by his Diſciples (*Jo.* 4. 2.): yet ſome conjecture from the practice *Acts* 19. 5.--*Jo.* 3. 22. that he himſelf at the firſt Baptized ſome of his Diſciples.

§. 4.

And all this Office, He, *as Man*, executed only by a derived and delegated power from the Deity, and from his *Father.*---*Chriſtus*, ut Homo, *remittit peccata, dat Spiritum Sanctum, vitam æternam*, &c. *poteſtate tantùm communicatâ & delegatâ, ſed modo excellentiori, quàm miniſtris ejus conceſſum eſt.*---*Chriſtus*, ut Homo, *ad has actiones concurrit tantùm inſtrumentaliter & meritoriè: non ut Efficiens principale; ſed tamen ut Inſtrumentum efficienti huic conjunctum, & ſingulare, non ſeparatum, & commune; qualia ſunt inſtrumenta, Apoſtoli, & Prophetæ.*

This is the Doctrine of the Schools, that you may not here ſuſpect any Paradox. And, in this Office, he was, at the firſt, conſtituted a Miniſter of the *Circumciſion* only; *i. e.* of the *Jews* (*Matt.* 25. 24.--*Acts* 10. 36.--*Rom.* 15. 8.); according to which Commiſſion, he, for a certain time, limited alſo his Diſciples (*Matt.* 10. 5, 6.--*Acts* 13.46.). To which *Jews* he preached moſtwhat in Parables. For ſo it pleaſed God, that, till his neceſſary ſufferings were accompliſhed, the People's ignorance ſhould not be quite diſpelled, and that this true Light ſhould riſe upon the World by degrees, and not all at once, (*Matt.* 13. 11.--1 *Cor.* 2. 8.).

CHAP. II.

§. 5.

Having fulfilled his Miniſtery, and ſuffered Martyrdom for the Truth, he being to depart hence, ordaining others in the ſame Office.

AND now, after about three years preaching, and doing other *Apoſtolical* Offices, the days of his Miniſtery being come to an end, and he, having laid down his life alſo, and ſuffered Martyrdome for the Truth, which he taught, (1 *Tim.* 6. 13.) and being to return unto his Father's Court, for the further negotiating, and advancing there the affairs of the Church, (*John* 16. 7.–*Heb.*8. 1, 2.), and (mean while) the ſame Truth being neceſſary to be preached

preached ſtill here on earth; ſins remitted; the *Holy Ghoſt* conferred; the *Sacraments*, for theſe ends, adminiſtred; to the end of the World; to one Country after another; and, in them, to one generation after another; and the whole work of our Redemption alſo being now finiſhed, which was to be the Subject of this Preaching, (*John* 19. 30.), a little before his Aſcenſion into heaven, he addreſſed himſelf to *ordain* and to *anoint* others to perform this Office here on earth in his ſtead till his ſecond coming.--

1. First, △ The Solemnity of whoſe *Ordination* by, and *Commiſſion* from, him you may find, as to one chief part thereof (*viz.* the power over his Myſtical Body, the Church, in Preaching, Baptizing, Remitting ſin, *&c.*) ſet down in *John* 20. 21, 22, 23.--*Matt.* 28. 19, 20.--*Mark* 16. 15. --*Luke* 24. 47. after our Lord had conferred on them formerly the other chief part of their Office (*viz.* the conſecrating of his own Body in the *Euchariſt*) juſt before his death at his laſt Supper in the *Hoc facite* (*Luke* 22. 19.) [if you will accept of the Church's expoſition of the Text; which hath always underſtood it to have a ſpecial reference, * as well to the conſecrating (or, bleſſing 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. in which Text we ſee alſo the *Apoſtolical* practice) and the breaking, and delivering of theſe holy Myſteries, that it ſhould be done only by the *Apoſtles*, and their Succeſſors; as * to the communicating, and partaking thereof, that it ſhould be done by all.].

Vide *Apoſtol. Conſtit.* l. 8. c. 52.--*Juſtin. Martyr. Apol.* 2.

2. 2. Again, △ the ſolemnity of whoſe *Unction* with the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Father*, in his ſtead, on *Whitſunday* (*i. e.* a Jubile, or ſeven Sabbaths of days after his Reſurrection, and ten days after his Aſcent, and the ceaſing of his own officiating here below) you may find in *Acts* 2. 1, &c. An anointing anſwerable to that anointing with the *Holy Ghoſt*, which *Chriſt* formerly had received from the *Father* at his Baptiſm (*Acts* 10. 37, 38.); and therefore our Saviour uſeth the ſame word of baptizing them with it *Acts* 1. 5. [*Ye ſhall be Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt not many days hence*]. The power of the Keys, and the Sacerdotal Office being enſtated on them in *John* 20. *chap.* But this power, or Office, not to be exerciſed, till

till this Deſcent of the *Holy Ghoſt* (*Acts* 2. *chap.*).

§. 6. To theſe therefore, as his Vicegerents, and Subſtitutes, he delivered the Doctrine, the Authority, and Miſſion, the Spirit, and Unction, which himſelf had received of the *Father* (See *John* 15. 15.— 17. 8, 18.—*Eph.* 3. 9, 10.—1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 13.—*Eph.* 4. 7, 8.—*Acts* 2. 33.—2 *Cor.* 1. 21.). Concerning whoſe miſſion, and authority, he left this teſtimony to the World—*As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you* (*John* 20. 21.—17. 18.), and *He, that heareth you, heareth me* (*Luke* 10. 16.—*Matt.* 10. 40.—17. 5.); as the *Father* had given before that teſtimony of his authority and miſſion,—*This is my beloved Son, hear ye him,* (*Matt.* 17. 5.). And ſo he promiſed to be with, and in them diſcharging their Miniſtery; as his Father was with, and in him (*Matt.* 18. 20.—28. 20.—*John* 8. 28, 29.—10. 38.—17. 23.). And hence alſo are his Attributes in ſome manner communicated unto them. They are ſtiled *Apoſtles* and *Biſhops* (*Acts* 1. 20.), as He (1 *Pet.* 2. 25.—*Heb.* 3. 1.). They are called Foundations (*Eph.* 2. 20.—*Matt.* 16. 18. compared with 21. 42.—*Rev.* 21. 14.), as he (*Matt.* 21. 42.). And they alſo, in ſome ſenſe, ſaid to be Saviours (*Jude* 23.—*Rom.* 11. 14.—1 *Tim.* 4. 16.), as he the judging of the World to be committed to them, as it was by his *Father* to him (*John* 5. 22.); and they admitted to ſit with him on Thrones, as he ſits on his *Father's* (*Matthew* 19. 28.—*John* 5. 22.—*Luke* 22. 30.—1 *Cor.* 6. 3.).

Transferring his Miſſion and Unction upon them.

§. 7. 1. Firſt then, To them he gave authority * to preach that *Goſpel*, which he founded; * to declare unto men all the counſel of God; to be Embaſſadors, for *Chriſt*, and in his ſtead, to mankind, concerning their reconciliation to God (*Acts* 20. 27.—2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19, 20.). Therefore they are ſaid * to ſpeak in *Chriſt*, (2 *Cor.* 2. 17.)—and the *Holy Spirit* to ſpeak in them (*Matt.* 10. 20.); * to be received as Angels of God, and as *Chriſt Jeſus* (*Gal.* 4. 14.); and, in their Miniſtery, * to be a ſweet ſavour of *Chriſt* unto God, both in them that are ſaved, by embracing their Doctrine, and in them that periſh, by refuſing it (2 *Cor.* 2. 15.).

1 Giving them authority to preach the *Goſpel.*

[Where

'[Where note, that this Office of publick teaching the 'ſacred Myſteries of Religion is one of the moſt *Apoſtolical* 'parts of the Miniſterial function (ſee *Acts* 6.2,4. —1 *Cor.* '1.17.): And that none ever rightly aſſumed it, (I ſpeak 'here of the Office; not of ſome extraordinary acts of 'this Function, permitted ſometimes to Learned Laicks 'by the licence of thoſe, who have their miſſion from 'Chriſt. Of which ſee more Sect. 104. *n.* 3.) but who 'were firſt ſpecially ſent from God with evident authority 'and commiſſion for it (1 *Cor.* 12.28. *Eph.* 4.11. [God 'gave Teachers] —*Heb.* 5.4. compared with *Rom.* 10.15.) '*Sent*, I ſay, either by Impoſition of hands, and Ordination 'to the Miniſtry, by thoſe, who were formerly ordained 'by Chriſt (ſee *Acts* 14.23. —20. 17, 28. —*Tit.* 1. 5.; a 'chief Duty, which they were deſigned to, being Teaching, '1 *Tim.* 3.2. —1 *Tim.* 5.17. —2 *Tim.* 2.2.): or by Impoſition 'of hands, uſed by the *Apoſtles* to all after their Baptiſm 'for receiving of the *Holy Ghoſt* (*Acts* 8.17. —19. 6.) 'whenever, upon ſuch Impoſition of hands God gave to a- 'ny, for the more ſpeedy propagation of the Goſpel, the '*extraordinary* gift of Prophecy, or of the word of Know- 'ledg, or of Wiſdom, *&c.*; by which gifts their Miſſion evi- 'dently appeared; (yet ſo, as that it underwent the judg- 'ment of their Seniors, ſee 1 *Cor.* 12.8,10. —14.19.). For 'the *extraordinary* gifts of the *Spirit*, upon ſuch Impoſiti- 'on of hands, were then given, and deſigned, not ſo much, '(if at all) for the greater ſanctification of the perſon, (ſee '*Matt.* 7.22. —1 *Cor.* 13. 1, &c.) as for the publick be- 'nefit and edification of the Church by them (*Rom.* 12.6,7. '—1 *Cor.* 12. 7.). Amongſt which extraordinarily gifted 'perſons, thoſe called *Prophets* were reckoned the next in 'dignity to the *Apoſtles* (*Epheſ.* 3. 5. —1 *Cor.* 12. 28. — '*Eph.* 4.11.). But yet *Teachers* or Doctors are numbred alſo 'amongſt the Orders Eccleſiaſtical, (*Eph.* 4. 11.) and a- 'mongſt extraordinary gifts, (1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29.) and are 'named as a ſingular Office (*Acts* 13. 1.) which office of 'teaching therefore all Believers might never promiſcu- 'ouſly uſe; but, * thoſe, who were called Prophets, E-

'vangeliſts,

vangeliſts, *&c.* 1 *Cor.*14. 1, 29.—*Eph.* 3. 5. (amongſt whom I reckon *Philip* and *Stephen*, *Acts* 6, 7.— 21. 8. as well as S. *Paul*, and others, *Acts* 13.1.); or, * thoſe, who were ordained Presbyters.—Amongſt theſe *Prophets*, *Evangeliſts*, &c, I reckon ſo many of the diſperſed in the firſt Perſecution at *Jeruſalem* (*Acts* 8. 1, 4.—11.19.) as, not in private Conferences only, but alſo in publick and ſolemn Aſſemblies, preached the Goſpel in foreign parts. For, Firſt; we may ſufficiently gather from *Acts* 4. 31.—and afterward more, from 1 *Cor.* 14. 26, &c, to the 34th. that the Gift of propheſying, and other eminent Graces conferred for the edifying of the new Church were then much diffuſed, and very common. [Yet not therefore then All Prophets, nor then All Teachers. 1 *Cor.* 12. 29.]. And, ſecondly, we may not think, that in this perſecution, all the Chriſtians univerſally quitted *Jeruſalem*, and were diſperſed: (For then the Apoſtles, the chief Paſtors, would have ſtayed there without any Flock; and ſee *Saul Acts* 8. 3. making havock ſtill of the Church there) but only, or chiefly, thoſe, who from their Miniſtry under the Apoſtles were more noted, and ſo in more peril. Neither, Thirdly, are we to imagine, that all thoſe diſperſed, were publick Teachers: Of which publick Preachers none is named, ſave *Philip*, and he is called an *Evangeliſt*; *Acts* 21. 8. and *Lucius* of *Cyrene* (ſee *Acts* 13. 1. compared with *Acts* 11. 20.); and he is called a *Prophet* (Ibid.). And it ſeems, that theſe of the diſperſed, who preached at *Antioch*, baptized alſo there, as *Philip* did at *Samaria*: for *Barnabas* and *Paul* when they came to *Antioch* ſeem to have found it a formed Church. *Acts* 11. 26. Yet, ſeeing that, in a flouriſhing Chriſtianity, we find Laicks alſo when eminent in learning ſometimes licenſed by Biſhops to teach publickly, I ſee no reaſon utterly to deny, that the ſame thing might be done in the Infancy of Religion, for a more ſpeedy growth thereof, by the Apoſtles licence; finding alſo, in the

'former Jewiſh Synagogue, Men permitted by the Ru-
'lers thereof to ſpeak there, only upon the ſcore of
'their being eſteemed perſons learned. See *Acts* 13.
'15.—and—*Acts* 18. 25, 26. before that *Apollos* had
'received compleat Baptiſm from the Church, or was
'made a fellow-Miniſter of S. *Pauls*. 1 *Cor*. 3. 5, 6.]

§. 8. 2ly. To them he gave authority, to receive complaints, and hear Cauſes; to decide Controverſies, and make Eccleſiaſtical Laws; for the eſtabliſhing of truth, peace, and order, in the Church of God (ſee *Matt*. 18. 17, 18, 19, 20.—*Eph*. 4. 11, 12, 14.—1 *Cor*. 11. 34.—14. *chap*.—16. 1.—4. 17.—1 *Tim*. 5. 14.): and that, in the name * of the *Holy Ghoſt* (*Acts* 15. 28.): and * of *Chriſt* (*Luke* 10. 16.) and * of *God* (1 *Theſſ*. 4. 8.): *Chriſt* denouncing to the World, that, if they will keep his ſayings, they muſt keep their's alſo (*Jo*. 15. 20.).

2. To decide Controverſies, and enact Eccleſiaſtical Laws.

§. 9. 3ly. Again; to them he committed his Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; gave them authority, * to Baptize (or alſo to appoint others to Baptize), and admit, into the Church, and this Kingdom, thoſe whom they thought fit (*Matt*. 28. 19.—*Acts* 10. 47, 48.). Again; * to ſeal and confirm in Grace and in a greater perfection of ſpiritual gifts, by Impoſition of their Hands and by Prayer, thoſe who had been formerly Baptized (See *Acts* 8. 14, 15, 17.). And, after this again, from time to time, * to repair the decays and advance the growth of theſe Spiritual Perſons, thus regenerated and confirmed, with a frequent adminiſtration to them of the divine nouriſhment of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, the Evangelical Sacrifice, that was offered to God upon the Croſs, which addeth ſtill new ſpiritual ſtrength and vigour to all the worthy Eaters and Partakers thereof; a conſtant diſpenſation of which Heavenly food, an εὐλογία, a Bleſſing of this Cup of Bleſſing, and breaking of this Bread of life (1 *Cor*. 10. 16.) our Saviour appointed them in the *Hoc facite* mentioned before, that they ſhould continue it (admitting the worthy thereto, and excluding the unworthy 1 *Cor*. 5, 6, 7, 8.) to all the faithful, till his coming again (1 *Cor*. 11. 23, 26.):

3. Giving to them the Keys of Heaven, to remit and to retain Sin, and to adminiſter the Holy *Sacraments*.

V. §. 5.

26.): as his Holy hands had firſt adminiſtred it unto them. And ſee the practice *Acts* 2.42,46.—*Acts* 20.11. in which Texts the *breaking of Bread* includes as well the Miniſtration of the Euchariſt, as of the Oblations; as may be gathered from the Diſcourſe 1 *Cor.* 11. 20, &c, where the Euchariſt and the Charity-Oblations are diſtributed together at the ſame meeting. (In the diſtribution of both which, when the Church was numerous, certain Miniſters were choſen to aſſiſt thoſe who conſecrated. *Acts* 6.). Again; after this their admitting Men into the Kingdom of God and the Society of the faithful, and their giving them this their ſpiritual food in due ſeaſon, He gave theſe his Subſtitutes power alſo, upon the relapſe and back-ſliding of any by new Sin from this their regenerate condition, * to chaſtiſe and eject, out of the Church and their title to this Kingdom, the pertinacious; and to reconcile the penitent; * to take Confeſſions and ſubmiſſions; to bind, abſolve; remit Sin, and revenge it; and that *by the Power of Chriſt*, *and in the Perſon of Chriſt*; *as being the Glory and Image of Chriſt*; *and as* Chriſt *ſpeaking* and giving ſentence *in them*; *and promiſing*; *himſelf to bind and looſe in Heaven*, *what they* ſhould, *on Earth.* (*See* Matt. 18. 18.—1 *Cor.* 5. 4.—2 Cor. 2. 10.—13.3,10.—8.23.*compared with* 1 Cor.11.7.).

§. 10.

4ly. Them he appointed to be the publick *Interceſſors*, and *Mediators* to God, here on Earth, for the People, in all their neceſſities: and to offer up their publick ſervice of prayers and praiſes unto him. For, the Miniſtery of the Apoſtles and Prophets under the new Teſtament, (who are the Succeſſors of *Chriſt* in theſe Offices) muſt not be made inferior to the Prieſts and Prophets under the old, the Succeſſors of *Moſes* and *Aaron*; Whoſe officiating in this kind, you may ſee *Heb.* 5. 1.—*Exod.* 32. 30.—*Lev.* 16. 7, 34, 17.—2 *Chron.* 30. 27.—*Ezra* 10. 4.--2. 17.--*Jer.* 7. 16.--27. 18.— To which add *Gen.* 20. 7.--*Job* 42. 8. In like manner, the Miniſters of the new Teſtament are ſaid λειτουργεῖν τῷ Κυρίῳ (*Acts* 13. 2.) (whence their publick ſervice is called *Liturgy*;) to

4. To make publick Interceſſions.

1. By Prayer.

to minister not only to Men, in the word and Sacraments; but to the Lord in prayers, praises, and spiritual Sacrifices, Correspondent to the λειτουργία, * of the former Priests under the Law; and * of our Saviour, now, in the Heavenly Sanctuary. *Heb.* 8. 2. — 1. These therefore Christ appointed to be the λειτουργοὶ for prayer (*Acts* 2.42. —and 46. 47.--*Acts* 6. 4.--*Jam.* 5. 14, 15.--*Acts* 13. 2, 3, 4.--1 *Tim.* 2. 1.): Our Saviour having made a special promise to them, as well for his Father, as for himself, that their requests shall be heard, and what they ask, granted (*Matt.* 18, 19.--*Jo.* 15, 16.--16. 23.). And indeed if the Holy Spirit speaketh in them to Men; (*Matt.* 10. 40.) then we are to imagine; 1. that the same Spirit speaketh in them to God also: and next: 2. that, to whom the Holy Ghost is most copiously promised and communicated, their's should be the most acceptable and effectual intercessions; Which *Holy Ghost* is now the great *Intercessor* here on Earth (*Ro.* 8. 26, 27.); as our Saviour is in Heaven. And according to this we find (in *Rev.* 5. 8.) the 24 *Presbyters* holding, in their hands, golden Vials full of Odours, which are the prayers of the Saints to be offered up to him, that sate upon the Throne. 2. Next, these also Christ appointed * to be the λειτουργοὶ of the Evangelical *Sacrifice*, his own Body and Blood; and * to make, therewith, a continual commemoration before the Lord for ever (the most effectual Intercession that can be) of that most acceptable and sweet-smelling Sacrifice, which put an end for ever to all other Sacrifices, and which was offered upon the Cross (1 *Cor.* 11. 24.); * To represent the all reconciling Crucifixion (*Gal.* 3. 1.); and * to set forth the Lord's death perpetually until his second coming (1 *Cor.* 11. 26.); Lastly * to offer unto God daily that one only perpetual Christian pure Offering as well of the Gentile as the Jew, foretold *Mal.* 1. 11. by partaking of which Oblation and Sacrifice we come to have fellowship and Communion with God, as the Jews, by eating of their Levitical Sacrifices, came to partake also of the Altar, and

1.

2.

* 2. And by the Evangelical *Sacrifice*.

and of all the benefits and Benedictions therefrom; and as the Gentiles, by eating of the Sacrifices offered to Idols, came to have Fellowſhip with Devils 1 *Cor.* 10. 18, 20, 21. For *menſa Domini* in this Chapter runs parallel with *menſa dæmoniorum*, and with the *altare Iſraelitarum*; and if the partaking of this Table be correſpondent to the partaking of thoſe Altars, then ſo alſo is *Corpus Domini* to the Sacrifice of thoſe Altars: and the reaſon, why we are ſaid to have Communion and amity and a league with God, as they with Devils, is, becauſe we here eat, * of God's bread (See *Levit.* 21.6.---3.11.) * of the Memorial of that Sacrifice which was offered upon the Croſs; as they, of that Sacrifice which was offered to Devils. For, were not Chriſt's Body and Blood offered, to God a *Sacrifice*, as well as to us a *Sacrament*, we could not, this way, contract a fellowſhip with Him in eating thereof. By eating whereof we come alſo to have fellowſhip with all others that eat thereof (1 *Cor.* 10. 17.). This offering and breaking and bleſſing of this Bread and Cup, therefore, is another part of λειτουργοῦντες *Acts* 13. 2. which is ſet down alſo in the formentioned Texts *Acts* 2. 42, and 46.—*Acts* 20. 11. (which was alſo performed, before, by our Saviour. *Luke* 22.19.—24.30,35.).

5ly. On them he breathed, and conferred the *Holy Ghoſt* in an extraordinary meaſure (mentioned before §. 5.) whereby they might be more clearly illuminated in the myſteries of Religion; and might more vigorouſly and irreſiſtably exerciſe their function (See *Matt.* 10.20.—*John* 16. 13, 25.—*Acts* 5. 3.—7. 51.—15 28.—2 *Cor.* 6.4,6.). 1ſt. Whereby, they * had command both over the ſouls, and over the bodies of Men, and had the arraigning and judgment of their deeds committed to them by *Jeſus*, as he had it committed to him by the *Father* (*Joh.* 5. 22.); * had power to convince men's conſciences; to diſcover their thoughts and ſecrets; to caſt down, throughout the World, the fond imaginations thereof, and every high thing that exalteth it ſelf againſt the knowledg of God; and to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience

§. 11. *n.* 1.

5. To theſe ends, Inſpiring them with the *Holy Ghoſt*.

1.

ence of Christ; and to revenge, with corporal diseases, with terrours of conscience, with *Satan* himself, all disobedience. And this by the power of Christ, and of the Spirit, acting in them. What I have said, you may find dispersed in these texts, when your leisure serves you to consider them.—*John* 16. 8.--2 *Cor.* 10. 6.--13.2,3,4,10.--10. 2, 3, 4, 5.--*Acts* 2.37.--1 *Cor.*14.24,25.--*Tit.*3.11.--*Acts* 6. 10.--1 *Cor.* 4. 19, 21.--5. 5, 10,12,13.--2 *John* 10.--3 *John* 10.--1 *Tim.* 1. 20.--1 *Cor.* 6. 3.--*Matt.* 19. 28. 2ly. Whereby they had command over *Satan* and evil spirits, and over all the power of the enemy of mankind, to discover and defeat their devices; to dispossess them of their strong holds; to undo the chains of their captives; to silence, and torture them (*Luke* 10. 18, 19, 20.--*Mark* 16. 17.--*Acts* 16. 18.--2 *Cor.* 2. 11.--*Acts* 8. 7.). 3ly. Whereby they received power to do the same miracles, as our Lord had done before, for the confirmation of their doctrine; and to speak with divers tongues, because their Commission was enlarged to all Nations.

2.

3.

§.11.*n.*2.

6. Lastly. To them he gave power to minister the *Holy Spirit* to others (in the same manner as they had received it) in the several Gifts and Graces thereof. To minister the Grace, * of Sanctification and Adoption to all the Faithful, and * of extraordinary gifts, for edification, to so many, for whom it pleased God to make use of their ministery (See *Gal.* 3. 2, 5.--2 *Cor.* 3. 6, *&c.*--*Acts* 8. 15, 17.--1 *Cor.* 12 c.). To minister the Grace of Apostleship, or ministration of the Gospel (*Rom.* 1. 5.--15. 15, 16.--*Eph.* 3. 8.--2 *Tim.* 1. 6.) to such persons as they saw to be fitly predisposed thereto (of which see more below §.35,&c.). These, Christ's Ministers, being impowered to do no less under the Gospel, than *Moses* under the Law (*Deut.*34.9.--*Numb.*11.); and *Elijah* under the Prophets (2 *Kings* 2. 15.).

6. 6. Giving them power to minister the *Holy Spirit* to others.

And, after all this authority and power committed to them, our Lord withdrew not himself from them, but continually assisted their ministery (—*Matt.* 18. 20.—*Acts* 18. 10.—*Mark* 16. 20.--*Acts* 11. 21.). He, as beseeching

ſeeching by them (2 *Cor.* 5. 20.), ſo working with them (2 *Cor.* 6. 1.-1 *Cor.* 3. 9.). He giving the increaſe, whilſt they planted and watered, (1 *Cor.* 3. 7.). And he opening the hearts (*Acts* 16. 14.) when they pricked them (*Acts* 2. 37.).

CHAP. III.

§. 12. n. 1.

Delegating his Authority and Office not with an exact parity to all.

THis his Authority being thus delegated by our departing Saviour to others; Next, he delegated this Authority not with an exact parity to all, but with a ſuperiority of ſome above the reſt, that ſo he might eſtabliſh amongſt them order and peace. As appeareth in general by thoſe Texts, * *Eph.* 4. 11. *that Chriſt gave ſome Apoſtles: and ſome Prophets: and ſome Evangeliſts: and ſome Paſtors*—and [yet more diſtinctly] * 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *that God* [*i. e.* by Chriſt] *conſtituted in the Church firſt Apoſtles: Secondarily, Prophets: Thirdly, Teachers, &c.*

§. 12. n. 2.

But the *Twelve* Diſciples advanced ‘to higher ‘dignity and ‘employments, than the *Seventy-two.*

Firſt therefore, whereas our Saviour had many more Diſciples; and of them did ſend to Preach the Goſpel not only theſe Twelve Diſciples at one time, but Twelve, ſix times doubled, (that is ſeventy two) at another; [Which ſeventy two, I ſuppoſe, after our Saviour's aſcenſion, we may ſafely number amongſt the ſecondary Miniſters before named, *Prophets, Evangeliſts, and Paſtors*, and may alſo preſume ſuch to have been employed both in preaching the Word, and adminiſtring the Sacraments; for our Saviour's ſending both the Twelve, and the Seventy two, now, when himſelf was yet a Preacher on Earth, ſeems only a *præludium*, an eſſay, and type, of his more compleat miſſion of them after his own departure hence]: I ſay, whereas both theſe Twelve, and theſe Seventy two were ſent by our Saviour, yet there ſeemeth a much higher dignity and office given to thoſe, than to theſe. △ As may be gathered, by thoſe Texts, *—*Luke* 6. 13. [*He called unto him his Diſciples, and of them he*

he choſe Twelve, whom alſo he named Apoſtles] * —*Mark* 3. 13, 14. [*And he went up into a Mountain and called unto him whom he would, and he ordained Twelve that they ſhould be* [conſtantly] *with him*, &c.]. Not that all theſe Twelve were now firſt called, or now firſt began to attend upon him; but that, though ſeveral of them were called before, yet was not the ſet number (anſwering the Twelve Tribes) compleated, nor theſe ſolemnly ſeparated, and endued with higher priviledges than the reſt, for preaching, curing diſeaſes, diſpoſſeſſing devils, &c, till now.—See likewiſe (*John* 6. 70.—17. 12.) our Saviour's ſpecial reſpect, care, ſolicitude, and interceſſion for theſe Twelve, and his diligent teaching and inſtructing of them upon all occaſions, more than of the reſt of his followers; his revealing to them the myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, and expounding apart all his parables unto them (*Matt.* 13. 11.—*Mark* 4. 34.); his fortifying them againſt ſufferings (*Luke* 12. 1, &c.); his foretelling them of his own ſufferings and the whole manner of his Death (*Matt.* 20. 17.); and fore-ſhewing them likewiſe his glory (*Matt.* 17. 1.). Thus more carefully training and breeding up theſe Twelve, as thoſe who were ſhortly to be left, in his place, (when aſcended) the chief Doctors of the World. See *Matt.* 5. 2, 13.—compared with 6. 20.—and 12. 1.—*Mark* 9. 30, 31, 35.--10. 32. Δ As may be gathered, again,* By the ſolemn re-miſſion of theſe Twelve (*Jo.* 20. 21.) mentioned before. * By the viſible deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon theſe only (*Acts* 2.); (at leaſt in a more eminent manner, as appears in the following ſtories); and by ſuch reverence given to them by the Church, that none other durſt join himſelf unto them (*Acts* 5. 13.) * By the ſolemn advancement and election of *Matthias* [one of thoſe who had accompanied with the Apoſtles even from our Saviour's Baptiſm, *Acts* 1. 22. and one of the *ſeventy two* as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and other ancient Writers, affirm] into an Apoſtleſhip, to make up the number of the Twelve, after *Judas* his Apoſtaſie from that Office. By all

Euſeb. l. 1. cap. 13.

all this it ſeems theſe Twelve were made of a much higher rank and order, than the reſt of the numerous Company of our Saviour's Diſciples, who were together with them promulgators of the Goſpel.

And to this higheſt rank was alſo not long after (within two years after our Saviour's Aſcenſion) added (by our Saviour's immediate election, and vocation of him from Heaven, and revelation to him of all the truths and Myſteries of the Goſpel) St. *Paul*, (one formerly of great Learning, Courage, and Zeal, though ignorantly miſ-employed 1 *Tim.* 1. 13.) to be the chief Apoſtle for the *Gentiles*, a People now alſo extraordinarily admitted into the Covenant of Grace (See *Gal.* 1. 1, 12, 13, 14. compared with 17.—2. 6, 7, 9.—*Rom.* 11. 13.—15. 15, 16.—1 *Tim.* 2. 7.—2 *Tim.* 1. 11.). It ſeeming beſt to the Divine Wiſdom, to employ another perſon diſtinct from the *Twelve* to be the Apoſtle for the Converſion of the Gentiles, and for their not obſerving of the *Moſaical* Ceremonies, or paſſing thro *Judaiſme* firſt to come to Chriſt, and for the open vindicating of the Univerſal Grace of God to the whole World independent on the Law (by which free Grace alſo himſelf was called, without having any former relation to Chriſt; nay being ſo great a Perſecuter; yet herein alſo he was a type of the like Converſion of his *Gentiles*, as himſelf frequently takes notice. See 1 *Cor.* 15. 8, 9, 10.—*Eph.* 3. 6, 7, 8.—1 *Tim.* 1. 13, 14, 15.): When as the former Twelve would have given great offence to their Jewiſh Converts, and a much greater Alarme to the whole Nation, had they themſelves thus inſtituted and educated the *Gentile*-Novices. As appears ſufficiently from their queſtioning of *Peter*, *Acts* 11. 2. and his compliance alſo for fear, *Gal.* 2. 12. and from the Jew's rage againſt St. *Paul*, *Acts* 21. 28, &c. when his fellow Apoſtles remained there unmoleſted. Though, for the greater conviction of the *Jews* in this matter, God choſe ſuch a one for this Apoſtleſhip, as was formerly a moſt violent Zelot for the Law: of which St. *Paul* reminds his Perſe- §. 12. *n.* 3.

 cuters

cuters in his Speech, *Acts* 22. ᶜ. and tho, when this queſtion was brought before the Apoſtles to be decided, the Phariſee-Converts of *Jeruſalem* going one way, and the Gentile-Converts of *Antioch*, (whoſe ſimple obſervance of Chriſtianity, unmixt with the Rites of the Law, gave them the honour of being firſt ſtiled *Chriſtians*) going another, all the other Apoſtles juſtified what St. *Paul* acted, and St. *Peter* was the firſt that ſpake boldly in it, on the *Antiochian*'s ſide; then alſo declaring that God firſt in his Miniſtery ſhewed an Abrogation of *Moſaical* Ceremonies, in giving his Graces to *Cornelius* and his Company, without them. See *Acts* 15. This Miſſion and Apoſtleſhip of St. *Paul* was manifeſted to the other Apoſtles by the mighty Signs and Miracles, with which they ſaw the Lord to accompany his Miniſtery amongſt the *Gentiles*; as St. *Paul* himſelf relateth *Gal.* 2. 8, 9. which Miracles, *&c*, were alſo declared to the Apoſtles in the Council held at *Jeruſalem* (*Acts* 15. 12.) at which time, *Peter*, *John*, and *James*, the Apoſtles Reſident there, upon it gave unto him and *Barnabas* his Aſſociate the right hand of Fellowſhip (*Gal.* 2. 9.).

§. 13. Now to theſe Apoſtles preferred thus above the reſt was alſo committed ſome power which was not common to all the reſt, who together with them preached and baptized: 1. As namely amongſt ſeveral others, (of which more anon) the power of conferring the *Holy Ghoſt*, and its extraordinary gifts, at, or after, Baptiſm. See *Acts* 8. 17. where the people of *Samaria*, being converted by *Philip* the Evangeliſt preaching there, and afterward baptized by him, yet the *Holy Ghoſt* fell upon none of them (*i. e.* in thoſe its extraordinary gifts ſerving for edification of the Church, mentioned before Sect. 7.), though *Philip* did many Miracles, till two of the Apoſtles were ſent from *Jeruſalem*, by their prayer and impoſition of hands, to procure the deſcent of theſe gifts upon them; whereby were produced and planted amongſt the *Samaritans* themſelves ſome Prophets, or Evangeliſts, or Paſtors and Teachers, for the future governing,

As; for *Confirmation.* 1.

verning, inſtructing, and edifying this Church: which *Simon* the Sorcerer ſeeing, he would fain have bought an Apoſtleſhip alſo, and have had a part and lot with them (verſe 21.). After which gifts thus communicated, by the Apoſtle's prayer and impoſition of hands, to the *Samaritans*, for the building up of that Church, we find both them and *Philip* to remove from thence. See the like, *Acts* 19. 5, 6. And this Impoſition of hands after Baptiſm, for conferring the *Holy Spirit* on the Baptized, is mentioned, *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. amongſt the principles of our Religion, and therefore is to be continued ſtill to the Church in after ages by the Apoſtle's Succeſſors.

§. 14.

2. And for *Ordination.*

2ly. The power of *ordaining* ſeveral Eccleſiaſtical Officers by impoſition of hands, prayer, and faſting. The Holy Ghoſt ſometimes firſt indicating the Perſons (ſee 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. compared with 1. 18. and *Acts* 13. 2.—20. 28.—1. 24. and the Teſtimony of *Clemens Romanus*, Ep. ad Cor. p. 54.—Conſtituerunt [Apoſtoli] primitias eorum in Epiſcopos, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι: and of *Clemens Alexand.* below §. 42. *n.* 8.). *Of their ordaining *Deacons* ſee *Acts* 6. 6. where the Diſciples, having choſen ſeven eminent Perſons, ſet them before the Apoſtles to receive impoſition of hands. By which, theſe received Ordination to the ſame Office as thoſe other Deacons ſpoken of 1 *Tim.* 3. 10, 13; (for the tables attended on *Acts* 6. 1, 2. were, partly at leaſt, the ſame with thoſe mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20.—10. 20.—*Acts* 2. 46.—20. 11.): though the *Deaconſhip* afterward was ſomewhat enlarged in its employments and attendance on the *Biſhop* and *Presbyters*. And * of their Ordaining *Presbyters*, ſee *Acts* 14. 23. which *Presbyters* we find alſo in the Church of *Jeruſalem* (*Acts* 11. and *Acts* 15.): * diſtinguiſhed from the Apoſtles, and from common Believers (*Acts* 15. 4.): * conſidering and decreeing matters together with the Apoſtles, (all the Church being preſent alſo at the conſultations *Acts* 15. 6.—16. 4.): and * entruſted with the Diſtribution of

the charity-mony ſent from *Antioch* to *Jeruſalem* (*Acts* 11. 30.): Theſe Presbyters therefore no doubt were Ordained here for the ſtanding Miniſtery of this Church by the *Apoſtle* of the *Circumciſion*; as they were in the Gentile Churches by the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, after this pattern of *Jeruſalem*; For here they were, before there any, (*Acts* 11.). And what was done in *Jeruſalem*, and in the Gentile-Churches, the ſame, we are to preſume, was done, by *Peter* and *John* (ſent thither for this purpoſe) alſo in *Samaria*, where they found the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt [*prophecy*, *word of wiſdom*, *word of knowledg*, &c, 1 *Cor.* 12. 8, 9, 10.] preparing the Perſons for this Office.

3. 3. Laſtly, the power of Ordaining ſuch, who ſhould be over both the Church and the Church-men, in the ſame manner as themſelves were; and who after their death, or upon their neceſſary abſence, whilſt living, might continue theſe Ordinations, both of thoſe who ſhould ſucceed in Inferiour Offices, and of thoſe who ſhould ſucceed in their own, until the World's end.

§. 15. △ Such was the Ordaining * of *Timothy* (2 *Tim.* 1. 6.—1 *Tim.* 4. 14.) and * of *Titus* (*Tit.* 1. 4, 5.) by the Apoſtle S. *Paul*.

§. 16. And △ ſuch, the Ordination of *Joſes*, one full of the Holy Ghoſt, and who had given his Eſtate to the poor, (*Acts* 11. 24.—4. 37.) by the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*; who alſo ſirnamed him *Barnabas*, Son of Conſolation. For, he being ſent from the Apoſtles, upon their intelligence of the new Converts at *Antioch*, for ſetling of the Church there, it is to be preſumed, that he received from them the ſame authority, as *Timothy* afterward did from S. *Paul*, of making Presbyters there; which authority he afterward exerciſed elſewhere, * together with Saint *Paul*, without any new Delegacy from the Apoſtles (*Acts* 14. 23.), and laſtly * without S. *Paul* alſo, when he took his Journy, accompanied with *Mark*, to do in *Cyprus* (his own Country), what S. *Paul* did in other quarters. And perhaps the ſame may be ſaid of many others.

others. For S. *Luke*, who only writ the Eccleſiaſtical ſtory of that time, toucheth very few paſſages of the Acts of the other Apoſtles, ſave only of S. *Paul*, and little alſo of him, ſave thoſe things when himſelf attended him: as appears by S. *Paul*'s words 2 *Cor.* 11. 23, &c.

[As for *Ananias*, (named only a Diſciple), his § 17.
impoſing hands on *Saul* at *Damaſcus*, and he, upon it,
receiving the *Holy Ghoſt*; this, being done by an ex-
preſs command from the *Lord Jeſus*, ſeemeth to have in
it ſomething extraordinary, and may not be urged as
a pattern of the Church's practice; no more, than S.
Paul's vocation to his Apoſtleſhip; or the deſcent of the
Holy Ghoſt on *Cornelius* and his company, before and
without Baptiſm, or Impoſition of hands *Acts* 10. No
more may the impoſition of hands by the Prophets and
other Teachers at *Antioch*, by a ſpecial command of the
Holy Ghoſt, upon *Paul* and *Barnabas*, be ſaid to be a-
ny ordination of them, to exerciſe now ſome authority
in the Church, or rather over many Churches, which
they could not formerly: that Impoſition of hands be-
ing either, △ of inferiours, both * to S. *Paul*, if we re-
member the relation he maketh of his ample Commiſſi-
on long before this (*Gal.* 1.) and * to *Barnabas*, if we re-
remember his Miſſion from the Apoſtles thither (*Acts*
11. 22.): or, at leaſt, not △ of their ſuperiours. Now
from ſuperiours is all Ordination, the Ordainer having,
and ſo conferring, ſome dignity which the ordained
wants. But this Impoſition of hands ſeemeth only to
be ſuch a ſpecial recommendation of them and their
affairs to God and his grace (ſee *Acts* 14. 26.) as S. *Paul*
received once again, from the ſame company, before
his ſecond Journy to the Occidental Gentiles (*Acts* 15.
40.). Impoſition of hands being a Ceremony uſed not
only in Ordinations, but in any requeſts preferred to
God for ſingle Perſons; whether for the increaſe of ſpi-
ritual graces, or for remiſſion of ſin, or for curing of
Diſeaſes, *&c.* But if Impoſition alſo in all theſe be
done ordinarily ſtill by ſuperiours, we muſt make this
an

'an extraordinary caſe coming from the divine com-
'mand, and the miſſion of theſe Perſons to be the act prin-
'cipally of the *Holy Ghoſt*, not of thoſe who were its
'inſtruments in this affair. As for S. *Paul*'s Apoſtleſhip
'over the Gentiles, we may conjecture, that He, upon
'our Saviour's call, and *Ananias* his baptizing of him,
'and the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on him, knew him-
'ſelf ſufficiently licenſed thereto, by what he ſaith of him-
'ſelf *Gal.* 1. *that immediately he conſulted not with Fleſh*
'*and Blood, nor repaired to the Apoſtles at* Jeruſalem:
'*but went from* Damaſcus *the contrary way, into* Arabia,
'*there to preach Chriſt* ἐθνεσιν, *to the Heathen or Gentiles,*
'(Gal. 1. 16.): *and, after three years ſtay there, return-*
'*ed to* Damaſcus, *and there preached Chriſt with all*
'*confidence, till the Governour keeping a guard to ap-*
'*prehend and to kill him, he was let down through a win-*
'*dow by the wall, and ſo eſcaped to* Jeruſalem; *where*
'*alſo he ſpake boldly and diſputed againſt the* Grecians,
'ſaith the Text (*Acts* 9. 29.) [*i. e.* thoſe foreign Jews,
'who ordinarily lived among the Gentiles (*Jo.* 7. 35.)
'Jews much Gentilized (1 *Pet.* 1. 17.—2. 9, 10.) who
'therefore belonged more properly to S. *Paul*'s Commiſ-
'ſion.] *Till, they alſo being about to kill him, and he like-*
'*wiſe being warned by Jeſus appearing to him as he was*
'*in an Ecſtaſie in the Temple, in ſaying his prayers there,*
'*to be gone quickly out of that City for that he was deſign'd*
'*by Him for the Gentiles,* (*ſee* Acts 22. 18.) *He eſcaped*
Gal. 1. 18. '*again thence* (Acts 9. 30.) *and after fifteen days ſtay*
'*only at* Jeruſalem, *went into the Regions of* Syria *and*
'Cilicia (Gal. 1. 21.) *and there preached the Goſpel,*
'(*not medling with the former planted Churches in* Ju-
'dea): *till* Barnabas, *who had former acquaintance with*
'*him at* Jeruſalem *and now ſtood in need of his help,*
'*fetched him from thence to aſſiſt him in* Antioch. So
'great a perſon was S. *Paul* before the Impoſition of
'hands at *Antioch*; and his employments before, not in-
'ferior to thoſe after, it. Though what ſucceſs his firſt
'labours had, or what Miracles they were aſſiſted with,

'eſpecially

eſpecially in his excurſion into *Arabia*, or whether his ‘
latter times were not more illuſtrious for the Conver- ‘
ſions and Miracles which God wrought by Him, we ‘
are left uncertain, becauſe little or nothing is regiſtred ‘
of thoſe his firſt actions, when he had none or few at- ‘
tendants of his Miniſtery. But if thoſe, who make ‘
Paul and *Barnabas*, at *Antioch*, firſt, initiated into their ‘
Apoſtleſhip, could ſhew me: 1ſt. How ſuch Perſons ‘
could be their Ordainers to ſo high an Office, without ‘
making the Ordination irregular and extraordinary, by ‘
reaſon that the Holy Ghoſt expreſly commanded it, (for ‘
ſurely if theſe Prophets were Apoſtles *ſecundi Ordinis*, ſo ‘
were S. *Paul* and *Barnabas*, as well as they, before this ‘
ordination): and, 2ly. how this Ordination will ‘
conſiſt with S. *Paul*'s exerciſing the ſame function for ‘
ſo many years before it, I ſhall willingly acquieſce in ‘
their Opinion.]‘

§. 18.

△ Such, again, was the Ordination of *James*, our Lord's Brother; who, being the Son of *Cleophas* (compare *Matt.* 13. 55.—27. 56.—*Mark* 15. 47. with *John* 19. 25.) not of *Alpheus* (*Acts* 1. 13.) and ſo none of the Twelve Apoſtles, (unleſs *Alpheus* and *Cleophas* denote the ſame perſon: and then his being called *James* the *leſs*, and his Brother *Jude* being of the Twelve, argue him ſo too, ſee *Mark* 15. 40.—*Luke* 6. 16.) was by them or ſome of them at leaſt (*Clement*'s *Hypotypoſes* ſay, by the three chief Apoſtles, *Peter*, *James* and *John*. See *Euſeb. l.* 2. *c.* 1,) Ordained Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; which, beſide the common Tradition thereof by Antiquity (ſee the Authors quoted in *Spalat. l.* 2. *c.* 2. §. 16.—and *Hegeſippus*, who lived not long after the Apoſtles, *apud Euſeb. l.* 2. *c.* 23.) is gathered from, his conſtant reſidence in that place, the addreſſes made to him there, and the diſpatches ſent from him abroad. So S. *Paul* (*Gal.* 1. 18, 19.) going up to *Jeruſalem* to ſee *Peter*, ſaith, *he ſaw none other of the Apoſtles there, ſave* James *the Lord's Brother*. And S. *Peter* (*Acts* 12. 17.) flying from *Jeruſalem*, after deliverance out of Priſon by an Angel,

Angel, ſendeth intelligence thereof to *James* and the Brethren; which is ſaid, as if none other of the Apoſtles were there. So the Diſciples, that came to *Antioch* from *Jeruſalem* (*Gal.* 2. 12.) are ſaid to be ſent thither from *James*. And S. *Paul* at his laſt return to *Jeruſalem* (*Acts* 21. 18.), without any mention of any other Apoſtles, is ſaid to go in unto *James*, all the Presbyters alſo being there preſent: and (*Acts* 15.) we find *James* ſpeaking laſt and concluding the Council, as *Peter* ſpake firſt. All which ſignifie what the Fathers generally deliver, that this *James* had ſome ſingular Eccleſiaſtical authority committed unto him concerning the government of the Church of *Jeruſalem*. And *Joſephus* maketh mention, by name, of his Martyrdom there, as of an eminent perſon. *Inter quos & fratrem Jeſu* (*qui dicitur Chriſtus*) *nomine* Jacobum, *quaſi contra legem agentem, accuſans tradidit lapidandum.* Who is alſo (*Gal.* 2. 9.) named before *Peter* and *John*, perhaps becauſe of this dignity joined with his being a-kin to Chriſt our Lord. This, from *Sect.* 12. of the great diſparity between the twelve Apoſtles, and others of Chriſt's Miniſters.

Antiq. Jud. l. 20. *c.* 16.

§. 19.

Again amongſt the Twelve, *Peter*, *James*, and *John* advanced above the other Nine.

Again: amongſt the Twelve Apoſtles themſelves, there ſeemeth not to be an exact parity. But *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are advanced to a greater dignity, and admitted to a nearer attendance, than the reſt. To theſe three only of the Twelve our Saviour gave Sirnames of honour at their election (*Mark* 3. 16, 17.) To *Simon*, the name of *Peter* or *Cephas* (of which more below); to the Brothers, *James*, and *John*, the name of *Boanerges*, Sons of Thunder; * becauſe of S. *James* his high undaunted language and freedom in his preaching, whereby He, firſt, drew upon himſelf the rage of *Herod* the King, and of the People, and was the firſt of the Twelve that was Martyred: And * becauſe of S. *John*'s celeſtial and lofty ſtile in his writings alſo, who the moſt eminently, amongſt the ſacred Pens, againſt the firſt hereticks and forerunners of the great Antichriſt, vindicated our Saviour's Divinity. Them three only our Saviour took

took with him, to have the plenitude of three witneſſes, when he did that great Miracle of raiſing the Ruler's Daughter from the Dead, *Mark* 5. 37. when he aſcended into the Mount, in the time of his exaltation (*Matt.* 17. 1.): and them three only again, when he retired into the further part of the Garden, in his great humiliation (*Matt.* 26. 37.). And after his Reſurrection *Peter* and *John* are choſen to eſtabliſh the firſt Converts of the *Samaritans* (*Acts* 8. 14.) and are ſtiled the pillars among the Apoſtles (*Gal.* 2. 9.).

§. 20. And again: *Peter* advanced to an higher dignity than the other Eleven.

Laſtly again, above the reſt of the Twelve, we may find S. *Peter* to have a ſpecial pre-eminence, if we will conſider ſeveral paſſages of Scripture. For, although we diſcover in the Scripture, alſo, the Keys of Heaven (*Matt.* 18. 18.) and the feeding and governing of Chriſt's Flock (*Matt.* 28. 19.—*Mark* 16. 15. compared with *Acts* 20. 28.) and of the Sheep of the *Circumciſion* in the firſt place (*Matt.* 10. 6.—*Luke* 24. 47.—*Acts* 1. 8.—*Gal.* 2. 9.) committed to all the Apoſtles; and all the Apoſtles, there, alſo called Foundations, on which the Church of Chriſt is builded (*Eph.* 2. 20.—*Rev.* 21. 14.); yet a donation of all theſe we find (again) made, in particular, to *Peter*: and *theſe*, as a charge and honour, beſtowed on him, for ſome eminent Graces which our Saviour found in him, above the reſt; as; the Keys were given unto him for his eminent Faith, (*Matt.* 16. 19.), and the care of Chriſt's Flock, for his eminent Love. *John* 21. 15. In which Texts, to make our Saviour thus to ſpeak to *Peter*; that, becauſe of his ſingular Faith, and Love, tranſcending that of the reſt of the Apoſtles, therefore he will make him a *Cephas*, a Foundation; and will give him the Keys of Heaven, and the Cuſtody of his Sheep, only, juſt in the ſame manner, and juſt in the ſa ne extent of power, as he giveth theſe unto the reſt of the Apoſtles, inferiour to him in ſuch Faith and Love, ſeems unreaſonable. [See the Fathers declaring the contrary, S. *Ambroſe*, in *Luc. c.* 24.—and *in Pſalm.* 43.—S. *Chryſoſtome*, *Hom.* 55. *in Matt.*—S. *Baſil*, *Serm.*

de Judicio Dei.—S. *Epiphanius, in Anchorat.*—*Arnobius, in Pſal.* 138.] But, if this be doubted of; yet, that S. *Peter* had ſome charge laid upon him, with an expreſs contradiſtinction to the reſt, ſee yet more clear in *Gal.* 2. 7. where S. *Paul* ſaith, that the Apoſtleſhip of the *Circumciſion* was committed to S. *Peter* in the ſame manner, as that of the *Gentiles* was to him. *When they ſaw* [ſaith he, *i. e.* the Apoſtles *James* and *John*,] *that the Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was committed unto me, as the Goſpel of the Circumciſion was unto* Peter. *For he that wrought effectually in* Peter *to the Apoſtleſhip of the Circumciſion, the ſame*, &c. *When the Apoſtles ſaw, that the Goſpel of the Uncircumciſion was committed unto me*; therefore it was committed to S. *Paul* from our *Lord*, and not from the *Apoſtles*; as alſo is clear from what he ſaith, *Gal.* 1. 1. [Paul *an Apoſtle not by Man*]: and then muſt the Goſpel of the *Circumciſion* be committed to *Peter* from our *Lord* alſo. Now, in *John* 21. 15. ſeems to be expreſſed the very time and place, where this Apoſtleſhip, or Goſpel of the *Circumciſion*, was thus committed to *Peter* by our *Lord*. For, here, Chriſt recommends to him the feeding of the Flock, which our Saviour then had the charge of here on Earth, and was now to leave: now, this Flock then was only the *Circumciſion*; the *Gentiles* being not, as yet, brought into his Fold. *John* 10. 16. And therefore *Chriſt* himſelf alſo is called the *Miniſter of the Circumciſion* (Rom. 15. 8.—Matt. 10. 5.): in which Miniſtry *Peter* ſucceeded him. [Of which thus *Spalatenſis* l. 1. c. 8. Sect. 10.—Petro *ſingulariter Chriſtus dicit*: *Paſce oves meas, hoc eſt*, Iſraelitas, *qui tunc ſoli erant Chriſti oves. Unde & dicebat: Non ſum miſſus niſi ad oves quæ perierunt domus* Iſrael. *Et* Paulus *ipſum* Dominum *vocat* Miniſtrum Circumciſionis. *Erant quidem aliæ oves nimirum* Gentiles; *ſed illæ nondum erant de ovili Chriſti.* And thus S. *Ambroſe* in *Gal.* c. 2. — *Ab his* [Apoſtolis] *probatum dicit* [*S.* Paulus] *donum, quod accepit à Deo, ut dignus eſſet habere Primatum in prædicatione* Gentium, *ſicut & habebat* Petrus *in prædicatione* Circumciſionis;

ciſionis; *& ſicut dat* Petro *ſocios, viros egregios inter Apoſtolos,* [i. e. James *and* John] *ita & ſibi jungit* Barnabam, *qui divino judicio* [Acts 13. 2.] *ei adjunctus eſt: gratiam tamen primatus ſibi ſoli vindicat conceſſam à Deo. Sicut & ſoli* Petro *conceſſa eſt inter Apoſtolos.*]

Here, to ſay, that only ſome ſhare of the *Circumciſion* was ſignified by the Apoſtle to have bin committed to *Peter*, namely that of the *Jews* which were diſperſed in other Regions, whereas thoſe in *Judea* were committed to *James*, ſeems no way juſtifiable. Becauſe, 1. The Apoſtleſhip of the *Circumciſion* is ſo ſaid to belong to *Peter*; as, of the *Gentiles*, to *Paul*; but *Paul*'s Apoſtleſhip extended to all the *Gentiles*. 2ly. Again; this giveth to S. *James*, and not to S. *Peter*, the chief Miniſtry of the *Circumciſion*; *viz.* the whole Body of the *Jews* in their own Country. 3ly. We find * S. *Peter*'s employments, eſpecially for the times preceding S. *Paul*'s diſcourſe had here with him, (in which time ſurely he exerciſed the Apoſtleſhip, which S. *Paul* here ſpeaks of) to have bin terminated moſtwhat within the Circuit of *Judea*; and * Him, as well as *James*, to have had his ordinary reſidence in *Jeruſalem*. There S. *Paul* found him, *Gal.* 1. 18.—and there he found him, *Acts* 15.—and thither S. *Peter* came, *Acts* 11. 2. after his Viſitation of the Churches in *Judea*, *Acts* 9. 32. And his very Epiſtles written to the diſperſed *Jews*, argue, that he had no ordinary reſidence among them. The ſame *Circumciſion* then was committed to *Peter*, that was alſo to *James* and *John*, (ſee *Gal.* 2. 9.). But the ſame *James* and *John* ſaw it committed to *Peter* in a more eminent way, (*verſ.* 7.). Which it ſeems appeared to them, and to all, not only from his Commiſſion, *John* 21. 15; but alſo from the effectual working of God (*i. e.* by mighty Signs and Miracles, and powerful Converſions) in *Peter* toward the *Circumciſion* (*Gal.* 2. 8.), like to that in S. *Paul* toward the *Gentiles*. For indeed we find greater Miracles done by S. *Peter* amongſt the *Circumciſion*, than by any other of the Apoſtles, and equalling thoſe which

§. 21.

1.

2.

3.

S. *Paul* did among the *Gentiles*: S. *Peter* raiſing the dead, *Acts* 9. 40.—and S. *Paul*, *Acts* 20. 10.— S *Peter*'s ſhadow curing the ſick, *Acts* 5. 15.—and S. *Paul*'s handkerchiefs, *Acts* 19. 12.—S. *Peter*'s ſtriking *Ananias* dead, *Acts* 5. 5.—and S. *Paul Elymas* blind, *Acts* 13. 11.—three thouſand Converted at S. *Peter*'s firſt Sermon, (*Acts* 2. 41.) four thouſand at his ſecond (*Acts* 4.4.): S. *Paul* being as fertile in his Harveſt of the *Gentiles*, (*Rom.* 15.17,18,19.). Theſe inſtances partly ſhew, what the Apoſtle relates, *Gal.* 2. 8. *that God wrought effectually in* Peter *to the Apoſtleſhip of the* Circumciſion, *and was mighty in* Paul *toward the* Gentiles.

§. 22. Beſides theſe Texts already quoted, there are many other paſſages in Scripture which ſhew *Peter*'s pre-eminency above the other Apoſtles: as; His (every where in the Goſpels) being placed the firſt, tho his Brother *Andrew* was the Senior Diſciple.—His being always the forwardeſt to anſwer our Saviour's demands, and to ſpeak in the name of his fellows: *Matt.* 14. 28.—15. 25.—16. 16.—17. 24.—18. 21.—19. 27.—26. 33.—(and ſo in the other Goſpels);—Our Saviours paying tribute only for *Peter* in lieu of all his Diſciples —After his Reſurrection, appearing firſt to *Peter*, before any of the reſt: (*ſeen of* Cephas, *then of the Twelve.*) 1 *Cor.* 15.—*Luke* 24. 34.—and, before this, ſending the meſſage thereof by the Women, particularly to *Peter*; *Mark* 16 7.—His ſpeaking firſt in their Convocations and Synods, and to the People, and before the Rulers (*Acts* 1. 15.—15. 7. and elſewhere in the *Acts*).—His pronouncing from God the ſentence of death, for their Sacrileage, upon *Ananias* and *Sapphira* (Acts 5. 9.)—His Peragration and Viſitation of the ſeveral Churches that were founded (*Acts* 9. 32.). His firſt opening the way, and beginning the firſt predication, to the *Gentiles*, from Divine Revelation (*Acts* 15. 7.)—*Ye know* (ſaith he) *Men and Brethren, how that a good while ago, God made choice among us that the* Gentiles *by my Mouth ſhould hear the word of the Goſpel and believe*: And ſo he was firſt queſtioned

John 1. 40, 41.

ſtioned for it, *Acts* 11. 2. As for *Philip*'s Baptizing the *Eunuch*, it might well be done afterward, tho it is related before by *S. Luke*, to give us the actions of *Philip* together. And, thus, to this Apoſtle the great *S. Paul* alſo, tho his calling was wholly extraordinary, and ſubjected to none, (ſee *Gal.* 1. 1. &c.— and 2. 6, 9.) may yet ſeem to be in ſome ſenſe inferior and ſubordinate; both in this honour of the firſt Converſion of the *Gentiles*, given unto *S. Peter*; and in that the Baptiſm, and Impoſition of hands, (which latter he more than once received, and theſe by the expreſs order of him who called him to his Apoſtleſhip,) were performed by the Miniſtry of thoſe, who received this power from the Colledge of the Apoſtles, of which Apoſtles *S. Peter* was Chief.

§. 23. This, to ſhew you, that there ſeemeth ſome ſingular dignity to be committed to *Peter* over the Church, which was not communicated to all the Apoſtles. And I have the longer inſiſted on this matter, to diſcover unto you, how, from the very beginning of the Goſpel, our *Sa*viour inſtituted a due ſubordination in the Governors of the Church, to avoid *Sc*hiſms and Confuſions. As I ſhall now further ſhew you, how the ſucceeding Government of Eccleſiaſtical affairs under the Goſpel doth follow and reſemble the former under the Law, and how the Old Teſtament, in this alſo, proves a figure of the New.

§. 24. For, under the Law alſo there were, always, many ſubordinations of the Officers of the *Sa*nctuary. Firſt over the *Levites*, divided according to three Families, there were the chief Fathers of thoſe Families (*Exod.* 6. 25.—*Numb.* 3. 18, 19.). Over theſe chief Fathers again were three Princes or Prelats appointed; *Elizaphan*, *Eliaſaph*, and *Zuriel*, (*Numb.* 3. 24, 30, 35.); Over theſe three Princes again was one *Princeps Principum*, or chief of the chiefs appointed, *Eleazar* (*Numb.* 3. 32.). Again; amongſt the Prieſts alſo there were ſeveral ſubordinations. For over the Prieſts there were (Firſt) the Chiefs, or Elders of the Prieſts (2 *Kings* 19. 2.—*Jer.* 19. 1.

The diſparity of Churchmen under the *Goſpel* being ſutable to that under the *Law*.

1.

19. 1.—*Ezr.* 8. 29.—*Nehem.* 12. 12.—*Matt.* 2. 4.—
2. *Acts* 19. 14.). And 2ly. over theſe again was that chief Governour, or ſecond Prieſt under the High Prieſt, called the Governour of the Sanctuary, or of the houſe of God; as *Eleazar* was; and, afterward, the chief of the family of *Ithamar* did bear this Office, as the chief of *Eleazars* family did, the High-Prieſthood. And hence it happeneth, that ſometimes two chief or High-Prieſts are named (*See Numb.* 3. 32.—2 *Sam.* 8. 17.—1 *Chron.* 9. 11.—2 *Chron.* 31. 13.—2 *Kings* 25. 18.—1 *Kings* 4.
3. 4.—agreeing to which is that *Luke* 3. 2.). And 3. laſtly, over all was ſet the High Prieſt. As therefore under the Law there were theſe three moſt eminent ſubordinations; Levites; and over them Prieſts; and over theſe an High-Prieſt; (to which alſo anſwered in the Civil State of the Jews the ſeventy two Elders, then the twelve Princes of the Tribes, and over them all, *Moſes*): ſo under the Goſpel, we find at firſt in the loweſt rank the ſeventy two Diſciples; then the twelve Apoſtles; and amongſt theſe *Peter*, *James*, and *John* the chief, and over them Chriſt our Lord; the High-Prieſt of the Chriſtian Profeſſion *Heb.* 3. 1. Afterward, Chriſt being aſcended, we find Deacons anſwering in ſome manner to the Levites; then Paſtours and Teachers, as they are called (*Eph.* 4. 11.—1 *Cor.* 12. 28,29.) anſwering to the legal Prieſts; then Evangeliſts, Prophets, Apoſtles, anſwering to their chief Prieſts; and amongſt theſe Apoſtles, a *Cephas* or Primat, to whom is adjoined *Paul*, by an extraordinary vocation, Primat of the new Church, that was to be, of the *Gentiles*. Afterward, the Goſpel being now well planted, inſtead of ſome perſons extraordinarily gifted, as was neceſſary for thoſe firſt times, the ordinary ſtanding miniſtery of the Church were, Presbyters or Prieſts; and, inſtead of the Apoſtles, Prophets, and Evangeliſts deceaſed, were Biſhops; and, among theſe Biſhops, many ſeveral ſubordinations, (by reaſon of the amplitude of the Church) of Metropolitans, Primats and Patriarchs. Of which Patriarchs

Patriarchs alſo the Biſhop of *Rome*, Succeſſor in the Apoſtolical See of *Peter* and *Paul*, was always accounted the chief, and is now ſo acknowledged even by the Reformed, as well as the Romaniſts. For, when-as under the Goſpel the true Religion is much further extended, than it was under the Law, there is not leſs, but more reaſon and neceſſity, that there ſhould be (there) ſome chief Governours over the reſt; to contain all theſe Church-Officers in unity; where there is more danger of their falling into diviſions; as, there is more danger of their falling into diviſions, where is a greater multiplicity of perſons.

CHAP. IV.

§. 35. Chriſt ſending, as the Apoſtles, ſo others their Succeſſors, to the end of the World.

THus much, from Sect. 5., having been ſpoken of thoſe firſt perſons, whom our Saviour, the firſt Apoſtle of the Goſpel, departing hence deputed and ordained in his ſtead. In the next place he provided alſo that this great Office, ſo neceſſary for the ſame ends, to all Generations, as well as to the preſent, (*viz.* for the diſpenſing and adminiſtring to them the ſame Goſpel, and the ſame Sacraments, and the ſame Spirit, *Gal.* 3.5. for remitting and retaining ſins, reconciling Penitents, excommunicating the rebellious, *&c*,) ſhould not, ſoon after, expire with them, but ſhould by them alſo be propagated to poſterity, by their Ordination of others; and thoſe again, of others, to the end of the World. Which perſons, their Succeſſors for ever, and not only the Apoſtles, He, the great Paſtor of the Flock, who liveth for ever, and who is aſcended to receive and beſtow gifts on men (*Eph.* 4. 7, 8.), He, I ſay, in like manner is ſaid to ſend ſtill; and to furniſh them with all neceſſary Graces for their embaſſy and employment. He breaths ſtill from Heaven on their Succeſſors (as well as he did on them), when his Deputies

puties here on Earth lay on hands; and He gives an Unction of the Holy Ghoſt, when theſe ſay, *Receive the Holy Ghoſt. An Unction*; not alike on all others, as on the Apoſtles; but yet a certain meaſure of its Graces, ſufficient for the diſpenſation of his Goſpel, according to the ſeveral capacity and already-received illumination of the times, wherein theſe his Embaſſadours do live. See to this purpoſe (* *Eph.* 4. 8, 11, 12, *&c.*) our Saviour's being ſaid to give, as the Apoſtles, ſo alſo the Paſtors and the Teachers, that were made by the Apoſtles.—(* *Matt.* 23. 34.) His ſending Prophets, Wiſemen, and Scribes; words, which involve not only the Apoſtles, but the whole ſucceſſion. —(* 1 *Cor.* 12. 5.) διακονίας, or Eccleſiaſtical Offices, ſaid to be from the Son, the Lord Chriſt; as χαρίσματα are from the Spirit, —(* *Acts* 3. 26. — 5. 31.—*Heb.* 12. 25.— 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20.), our Saviour ſpoken of, as performing ſtill here his Apoſtolical Office by theſe his Miniſters.—See (* *Acts* 20. 28.) the Holy Ghoſt (which proceedeth from him) ſaid to make the Biſhops that were to govern the Church of *Epheſus.*—See (* *Rom.* 10. 15.) the queſtion asked, how they could preach, *i. e.* ſuch things, as were to be the ſubject of their preaching, namely concerning remitting of ſin, regenerating, reconciling of Men to God, *&c*, unleſs they were ſent? *Sent*: *i. e.* by God, *Heb.* 5. 4. For *this honour no man taketh unto himſelf, but he only that is called of God.* See (* 1 *Cor.* 2. 5, 13.) their preaching to little purpoſe without this Miſſion; as the effect of which preaching, for ever, conſiſteth *not in the Wiſdom of Man*, which worketh contrary to God's Wiſdom, (by it accounted fooliſhneſs), but *in the power of God* and demonſtration of the Spirit. See (2 *Cor.* 12. 3.—*Matt* 16. 17.—1 *John* 4. 2. — *Luke* 18. 34.—*Acts* 16. 14.—*James* 1. 5, 17.—3. 15, 17.—*Eph.* 3 5.—1 *Cor.* 2. 14, 16.) the ability of knowing the truths of God, which is communicated to theſe teachers, proceeding from the illumination of God's Spirit given unto them, in an higher manner,

ner, according to the Offices, to which they are by Chriſt, through his appointed Ordainers, deſigned.—(*Rom.* 15. 15, 16.) *S. Paul's* Apoſtleſhip called a grace.—And (1 *Tim.* 4. 14.—2 *Tim.* 1. 6.) the ſame gift received by and continued to thoſe, whom the Apoſtles ordained, as was before to thoſe, whom our Saviour ordained.—2 *Tim.* 1. 14. compared with 13. The ſame doctrine preſerved in the Apoſtles ſucceſſors by the Holy Ghoſt.—Laſtly ſee (2 *Cor.* 8. 23.—*Phil.* 2. 25.—*Rom.* 16. 7.—*Rev.* 2. 2.—*Acts* 14. 4, 14.) thoſe, that were Ordained by the Apoſtles, called alſo Apoſtles.

§. 36. *n.* 1.

Chriſt aſſiſting, as the Apoſtles, ſo their Succeſſors to the end of the World.

And, as the Lord Chriſt ſendeth and authoriſeth, ſo he continually aſſiſteth in this their Office, with his ſpecial illumination, direction, and power, not only his Apoſtles, but alſo their Succeſſors to the end of the World. See (* *Matt.* 28. 19, 20.) *upon his ſending them away to teach the Nations, his promiſing to be with them,* [*i. e.* with the Teachers of theſe Nations] *to the end of the World*—(* John 14. 16, 26.—16. 13. compared with *Acts* 15. 28.—1 John 5. 20, 27.—1 Cor. 12. 7, 8.) *his promiſing them a* παράκλητος [*i. e.* an aſſiſtant] *that ſhould abide with them for ever; to teach them all things; and to bring all things to their remembrance. For ever: i. e.* not to the Apoſtles only; for, then, what would become of the Nations, that, after their times, were ſtill to be inſtructed? but to their Succeſſors alſo—(* *Matt.* 18. 20, compared with 17, 18,) his promiſing, that, *when they were gathered together in his name,* [to hear the cauſes brought to the Church,] *he himſelf would be in the midſt of them; and would ratifie in Heaven, what they ſhould do upon Earth;* which implieth alſo, that he would aſſiſt them on Earth, at leaſt when this is a ſupreme and unappealable Church-authority, to do, as to the main, both what was meet to be ſubmitted-to by thoſe whom he ſent to their tribunal, and what was meet for to be ratified by the Heavenly Tribunal.—See (* *Matt.* 16. 18, 19.) his promiſing, *that the Gates of Hell ſhould never*

ver prevail againſt thoſe to whom he gave the Keys [*i. e.* againſt the Clergy]; *nor againſt the Church built by, and upon, them.*—See (* 1 Tim. 3. 15.) *the Church* (*unlimited to the Apoſtles days*) *ſaid to be the pillar and ground of truth; ſurely this from its Teachers*—and (2 Tim. 2. 19. compared with 16, 17, 20.) *the foundation of God, the Church ſtanding ſure:* notwithſtanding that *Hymeneus* and ſome others, (as Veſſels in this great Houſe of God, not of Gold and Honour, but of Earth and Diſhonour,) had erred from the truth thereof.—See (* *Eph.* 4. 11, 13.) *his giving theſe teachers, that the World ſhould not be toſſed to and fro with every wind of Doctrine.* In whoſe Doctrine therefore, in order to this end, this donor hath fixed ſome ſtability.—And (*Rev.* 1. 13, 16.) our Saviour (to denote his perpetual preſence to theſe ſucceeding Teachers and Governours of his Church), after all the times of all the Apoſtles, ſave *John*, is deſcribed, though in glory, yet walking in the midſt of the ſeven Mother-Churches of *Aſia*, and holding their Biſhops in his hands.

§. 36. *n.* 2. Here; 1. to allow only ſuch an Hypothetical aſſiſtance promiſed by our Saviour, whereby he will preſerve his Church (the Paſtors and the People) in the orthodoxneſs of the faith till the end of the World, if they ſhall not fail in doing their duty; but not, ſuch an aſſiſtance, whereby he engageth abſolutely to preſerve them orthodox for truth ſufficient for ſalvation till the World's end, ſeemeth very unreaſonable. For, thus, the promiſe of Chriſt, whilſt depending on a conditioned righteouſneſs of Men, may be rendered of no effect; his foundation not ſtand, ſure; the Gates of Hell prevail; and both the Hierarchy, and Chriſtianity, and the Goſpel it ſelf, be decayed and loſt and vaniſhed out of the World, before the end thereof, notwithſtanding all theſe fair promiſes. 2. Again, to allow ſuch a promiſed aſſiſtance, as ſhall effectually preſerve the exiſtence of the Goſpel, and the Orthodoxneſs of ſome Chriſtians or other, till the end of the World; but not the Orthodoxneſs

thodoxneſs of the Teachers and Paſtors of this Church, this ſeemeth very unreaſonable alſo; both becauſe (as you have ſeen in the proofs) this promiſe is particularly made to the Teachers; and becauſe, all the Teachers and Paſtors erring and miſ-expounding the ſacred writings to them, how ſhall the ſheep perſevere in the truth; eſpecially when theſe are enjoined, if they will be good ſheep, by the ſame writings, to follow and obey their Paſtors? 3. Laſtly; to allow ſuch an effectual aſſiſtance to the Teachers alſo and to the Clergy; and then to expound it to be given, ſometimes, only to ſome ſmall and inconſiderable number thereof; * to ſome few Teachers, ſuch as go from, or perhaps are caſt out by, the reſt, but not to the viſible Body of the Clergy; * to ſome particular Church-Guides, but not to any Court or Synod of them: Or, * to ſome inferior Synod perhaps, but not to the ſupream: Or, * to ſome members of the ſupream Synod, but not to the major part, the vote of which major part, the Church is to follow (I mean, ſuch a ſupream Synod, as conſiſts of the Members of the Church Catholick; which Church Catholick alſo is always contradiſtinct to, and eaſily diſcernable from, all other Heretical and Schiſmatical Sects): This, I ſay, is alſo moſt unreaſonable. Becauſe ſurely our Saviour's promiſed aſſiſtance to the Paſtors of the Church is in ſuch a manner, as that the Flock may enjoy thoſe, whom he aſſiſts, for its guides; Now, in any diſſent of ſome particular Paſtors from the reſt, or of the Inferior, from a Superior, Court, it is the Superior Court and not the Inferior, and the Major part here ſtill, and not thoſe few diſſenting, that are the People's lawful guides and directors. Otherwiſe *Arius* will pretend to be a guide againſt the *Nicene* Council; and *Neſtorius*, againſt the *Epheſine*.

CHAP. V.

§. 37. THis Eccleſiaſtical Authority being, thus, delegated by our Lord, not only to the Apoſtles, but to their Succeſſors, with promiſe of his perpetual aſſiſtance and protection of them: we find, in obedience thereto, the Apoſtles, before their departure hence, to have transferred their commiſſion to others; and to have given to theſe that authority, which themſelves had received from our Lord. Theſe therefore they ſolemnly ordained with prayer, and impoſition of hands (*2 Tim.* 1. 6.—1 *Tim.* 4. 14.—*Acts* 14. 23.): an antient Cuſtom in the Church of God, in conferring of Offices and ſolemn Benedictions (See *Gen.* 48. 14.—*Numb.* 27. 18.—*Deut.* 34. 9. [*And* Joſhua *was full of the Spirit of Wiſdom, for* Moſes *had laid his hands upon him*]). And to theſe, as to the Stewards of God, they reſign'd, and made o're the care and charge over his Church (1 *Pet.* 5. 2, 3.—*Acts* 20. 28.—*Titus* 1. 7.—1 *Timothy* 3. 15. 5. agreeable with —2 *Cor.* 11. 28.—*Luke* 12. 42.), laying a charge alſo on all the members of the Church to ſubmit to, and obey them, as having *curam animarum*; and not to deſpiſe them, (*Heb.* 13. 17.—*Tit.* 2. 15.—1 *Tim.* 4. 12. —1 *Theſſ.* 4. 8.).

The Apoſtles before their departure, according to our Lord's Inſtitution, transferring their Commiſſion on others.

Ordaining theſe with Prayer, and Impoſition of hands.

§. 38. To them, thus Ordained, they committed the aſſiduous preaching of the Goſpel (*2 Tim.* 4. 2.—2. 15.—1 *Tim.* 4. 11, 13.) and, in preaching, left them a ſpecial charge of keeping the ſame form of Doctrine, which they had learnt of their predeceſſors; and of preſerving the commandment that was committed unto them, without ſpot (1 *Tim.* 6. 13, 14, 20.—4. 16.—2 *Tim.* 1. 13, 14.—3. 14.—*Rev.* 3. 3.—2 *John* 6, 7.)—To them they committed authority to order the publick Divine Service, and all other things decently in the Church; to give rules concerning Chriſtian Diſcipline; and to rectifie

Some particulars of the Authority tranſmitted unto them.

fie what is amiſs (*Tit.* 1. 5.—1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2.—5. 7. agreeable with 1 *Cor.* 11. 34.—16. 1.—*Acts* 6. 6.—1 *Cor.* 14. *chap.*). 'So it is committed to *Timothy*'s 'care, that no Widows be taken into the Church's ſervice under ſixty years of age; nor into the Church's 'Charity, when their Children are able to maintain them '(1 *Tim.* 5. 4, 9, 16.)—That thoſe, whom he Ordained Biſhops, ſhould be no *Neophytes*; nor ſuch as had 'had two Wives (1 *Tim.* 3. 2, 6.)—That Women 'ſhould go modeſtly apparelled, and keep ſilence in the 'Church, and not teach (1 *Tim.* 2. 11, 12.)—That 'publick ſupplications, interceſſions, and thankſgivings, 'or Euchariſts, ſhould be made for all Governours and 'Civil Magiſtrates; and that Men ſhould not preſent 'themſelves to lift up their hands in prayer, when full of 'quarrels and conteſts (1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2, 8.)—That ample proviſion ſhould be made for well-ruling Presbyters (1 *Tim.* 5. 17. compared with 3.)—That none 'ſhould be admitted into the firſt Office of Deacon, 'till after ſome time of trial: nor any made Biſhop, 'who had not well miniſtred his Deaconſhip (1 *Tim.* 3. 10, 13.)]'—To whom they gave authority to hold Eccleſiaſtical Courts; and to receive accuſations; to convent before them publickly, and to correct, heretical and other diſordered perſons, to ſilence and ſtop their Mouths; to impoſe mulcts, and penances upon them; to excommunicate and, to ſeparate from, them; charging them in theſe Courts to prejudge no Mans cauſe and to do nothing for favour, or partiality. (See 1 *Tim.* 5. 1, 19, 21.—6. 5.—1. 3.—*Tit.* 3. 10.—1. 5, 10, 11, 15.—1 *Tim.* 5. 20.—2 *Tim.* 3. 5.—2. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.—1 *Cor.* 5. 12, 13.—*Matt.* 18. 17, 18, 20.—1 *Cor.* 4. 19, 21.—5. 4, 5.—2 *Cor.* 13. 2.—1 *Tim.* 1. 20.—3 *John* 9, 10.). 'So, *Rev.* 2. 2, 14, 15, 20. The Angel of *Epheſus* is commended by our Lord for trying 'falſe Apoſtles; and the Angels of *Pergamus* and *Thyatira* reprehended, for permitting the doctrine of *Balaam*, and the Doctrine of the *Nicolaitans*, and for ſuf-

'fering

'fering the Woman *Jezabel* to teach and seduce the 'People.]' To them they gave authority to absolve, forgive, and reconcile, penitents (1 *Tim.* 5. 22.——2 *Cor.* 2. 7, 10.): To reward the more deserving amongst the Clergy, with better stipends (1 *Tim.* 5. 17.) which, as also the provision for poor Widows, committed to *Timothy*, do intimate, that he had the disposal of the Church's stock, and the People's charities; as we find the Bishops after him had in the times following. See below §. 70.——To make solemn intercessions, benedictions, and recommendings, to God's grace, of those who have any special need thereof (*James* 5. 14. ——agreeable with *Matt.* 19. 13.——*Acts* 13. 3.——compared with *Acts* 15. 40.). Lastly, to them they gave order to ordain others; and to give to them, in special charge, the preaching of the same Doctrine, which they had received, and of none other, than what they had received, until the coming of our Lord (2 *Tim.* 2. 4. ——1 *Tim.* 6. 3, 14.——1. 3.——5. 22.——*Tit.* 1. 5, 9.).

§. 39. Their Function, as the Apostle's, of divine Institution.

Now, touching the authority of these persons thus ordained; seeing that the Apostles derive no Ecclesiastical authority on their Successors, but what they themselves received from Christ, who ever succeed them in any part of this authority, are rightly said to hold it from Christ, and their office rightly affirmed to be *jure divino*; as their's, who preach and administer the Sacraments; so their's, who also ordain, confirm, judge, and inflict censures; for all these the Apostles had from Christ. And if, when leaving this World, the Apostles made Successors so, as to give the whole plenitude of their own power received from Christ, to some, and part only thereof, to others; those Successors of theirs, who receive their whole power, will be said as truly to hold it from Christ, and *jure divino*, as the others, who, receive only a part; and if either of them hold it *jure divino* rather than the other, then surely he, who is more fully the Apostolical Successor, and who hath all the power

power of the other; but the other, only a part of his. And, if any contend, that it was our Saviour's inſtitution, that the whole Apoſtolical Office (I mean ſo much thereof as was to be of perpetual continuance in the Church) ſhould deſcend on all ordained; and not one part of it on ſome, who ſhould not have all the reſt (yet contrary to which, we ſee, is the Apoſtle's practice); the iſſue only will be this; that, if it be found, that ſuch as *Timothy* do ſucceed in the whole Apoſtolical Office, then, they muſt be ſaid to hold their Office *ex inſtitutione Chriſti*, or *jure divino*: And if the others, ſuch as the *Epheſian* Presbyters, be found to ſucceed only in part, becauſe *Timothy* preſides over them, then they ſhall hold their Office only *jure Apoſtolico*. Suppoſe then (to conclude) the queſtion be: whether in ſuch a caſe, *Timothy*, or elſe the Presbyters of *Epheſus*, are *jure divino*? If one of them only be ſo, *Timothy* will, rather, be ſo: ſeeing that the whole Apoſtolical power (I mean that which is to be perpetuated, which Apoſtolical power is from Chriſt, and therefore *jure divino*) was delegated by theſe Apoſtles to *Timothy*; but a part only thereof, to the Presbyters.

PART

PART II.

CHAP. I.

§. 40.

This Authority distributed to others, by the Apostles, not with an exact parity.

THis being said, *quo jure* the Apostle's Successors hold the Authority they derive from them: In the next place, if we enquire, how the Apostles distributed to others this Authority, which they received from Christ; we may discover, from the forecited Scriptures, and chiefly from those taken out of the three Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus* (occasionally written), that all parts of Apostolical Authority were not given to all, whom the Apostles Ordained, with an exact equality amongst them; but some Authority, [as that, of Ordaining, of keeping Courts, and inflicting Censures on the Ecclesiasticks, as well as others] given to some singular persons, with a subordination, to them, of the rest. Such Authority, we find in the foresaid Epistles, was committed by S. *Paul* to two antient Disciples of his, *Timothy* and *Titus*, in relation to the Churches, of *Ephesus*, or the Proconsular *Asia*; and of *Creet*. And what Authority we discover given to these persons here, the same we gather to have been given also to such like in respect of other Regions and Churches (though we have none of the Apostle's Epistles to them to shew for it) from these Reasons.

But one Presbyter in every Church advanced over all the rest.

§. 41.

First, Because we find that the Apostle specially indeavoured an uniformity in the Churches. 1 *Cor.*4.17.—7.17.—11.16. 2ly. Because we find, by all the evidence which History can afford us, * the same government, *de facto*, to have been, in the times next to the Apostles, established in all the rest of the Churches, as was in that

1.
2.

that of *Epheſus* and *Creet*: * the like Catalogues of their Biſhops; and, amongſt theſe, * the names of thoſe, who, in moſt Churches, were ſaid to be ordained by the Apoſtles for their ſucceſſors. So that, if not Epiſcopacy but Presbytery be Apoſtolical, the whole Catholick Church will be found, as it were, in a joint conſpiracy, ſo early, to have diſobeyed, and ſwerved from the Apoſtle's Orders; and that, without the reſiſtance, or complaint (in a matter of an uſurpt authority too) of any one particular Church, or perſon, that we hear of.

See a Collection of theſe firſt Biſhops, out of *Euſebius*, and others, in Dr. *Taylor*'s Epiſcopacy aſſerted, §. 18.— As *Dionyſius* the Areopagite at *Athens*; *Caius* or *Gaius* and *Ariſtarchus* ſucceſſively at *Theſſalonica* (*Origen* in Rom. 16. 23. & *Martyrol. Rom.*); *Archippus* at *Coloſſe*; *Antipas* at *Pergamus*; *Epaphroditus* at *Philippi*; *Creſcens* in *Galatia* (or *Gallia*, as ſome underſtand 2 *Tim.* 4. 10.); *Evodius* at *Antioch* [where S. *Ignatius* ſucceeded him] *&c.* §. 42. *n.* 1.

Catalogues of the Biſhops of ſeveral Churches in, and immediately after, the Apoſtle's days.

And this account S. *Hierome* (he, whom the Presbyterians take for the great Patron of their cauſe) *de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* gives of the ſame primitive Biſhops.— *Jacobus ab Apoſtolis, ſtatim poſt aſcenſionem Domini*, Hieroſolymorum *Epiſcopus ordinatus, ſuſcepit Eccleſiam* Hieroſolymæ [*qui ſucceſſorem habuit* Symeonem. *Jerom in Gal.* 1. 19. and his ſucceſſor was *Juſtus*, *Euſeb. l.* 3 *c.* 11, 19, 32.] Timotheus *à* Paulo Epheſiorum *Epiſcopus ordinatus*: [This appearing from Church-tradition, as well as S. *Paul*'s Epiſtles. See *Euſeb.* Hiſt. *l.* 3. *c.* 4. whoſe Succeſſor was *Oneſimus*; ſee *Euſeb.* l. 3. c. 33.]. Titus *Cretæ*, Polycarpus, *à* Johanne, Smyrnæ *Epiſcopus ordinatus*. To whom may be added, out of the ſame Father, * *Epaphroditus* Apoſtle or Biſhop of the *Philippians*. For *paulatim* (ſaith he), *tempore procedente, & alii ab his, quos Dominus elegerat, ordinati ſunt Apoſtoli: ſicut ille ad* Philippenſes *ſermo declarat, dicens neceſſarium exiſtimavi*, Epaphroditum, *&c. Phil.* 2. 25.—And * *Mark* Biſhop of *Alexandria*; for he ſaith; §. 42. *n.* 2.

The account of theſe Biſhops given * by S. *Hierome.*

Com. in *Gal.* 1. 19.

De Scriptor. Eccles. Marcus *primus* Alexandriæ *Christum annuncians, constituit Ecclesiam.* And in another place.—*Marcus interpres* Petri *Apostoli, &* Alexandrinæ *Ecclesiæ primus Episcopus.*—And elsewhere: Alexandriæ *à* Marco *Evangelista usque ad* Heraclem *&* Dionysium *Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum Episcopum nominabant, &c.*

In Titum. c. 1. See his *proem in Mat.*

§.42.*n.*3. Thus S. *Hierome* of the persons in several places ordained Bishops by the Apostles, and surely, in saying that such Presbyters were ordained Bishops, he meaneth: 1st. That they had a new ordination distinct from that of Presbyters; for we suppose the Father to use this word according to the signification thereof in his own times: and we can shew a distinct Ordination of Bishops in his time; and long before it; and that, by a new imposition of hands of three persons of the same order in ordaining them. ['So *Cornelius* Bishop of 'Rome *A. D.* 255. writes to *Fabius* touching the Ordi- 'nation of *Novatianus*; *Hosce* [*tres Episcopos*] *manu-* 'um impositione Episcopatum ipsi [Novatiano] *dare coege-* 'runt.—And the same Bishop to S. *Cyprian*—*commisere* 'quoque Schismatica—*ut paterentur ei manus, quasi in Episcopum, imponi.*—And thus S. *Cyprian* of the manner of 'Bishop's Ordination (*Ep.* 68.).—*Ad ordinationes ritè* 'celebrandas, *ad eam plebem, cui Præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniunt: & Episcopus deligitur, plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissimè novit. Quod & apud vos* [Hispanos, to whom he 'writes] *factum videmus in* Sabini *Collega nostri ordinati-* 'one; *ut de universæ fraternitatis suffragio, & de Episcoporum, qui in præsentiâ convenerunt, judicio, Episcopatus ei* 'deferretur, *& manus ei in locum* Basilidis *imponeretur.* 'See also *Cyprian* Ep. 52.—*Euseb.* Hist. *l.* 5. *c.* 9. of the 'like Episcopal Ordinations. Bishops then long before 'S. *Jerom*'s time had a different Ordination from Pres- 'byters.]' And then 2ly. this new Ordination will infer some new Authority.—And 3ly. whatever new Authority this Father understood, by such Ordination, to have been conferred on some; on *Timothy* and *Titus*, Bishops;

Apud Euseb. *l.* 6. *c.* 42.

Apud Cyprian. *Ep.* 46.

1.

2.

3.

Biſhops; the ſame he underſtood to have been conferred on *Polycarpus* and *Epaphroditus*, and the other, Biſhops. And hence I think will that fancy of *Blondel* (ſee below §. 79.) and others, be removed, that the Senior Presbyter in thoſe days was the Biſhop, without any new Ordination. Againſt this forenamed roll of Biſhops it is ſaid; That it appeareth not from *Hegeſippus* (who is quoted for it by *Euſebius*), that *James* was made Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* by the Apoſtles: *Hegeſippus* his words, being, only theſe, διαδέχεται τὸν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. R. But *Hegeſippus* is not the only Author, from whom *Euſebius* and *Jerom* had this, but, from *Clem.* his *Hypotypoſes* alſo, whoſe words likewiſe are cited by *Euſebius*, and are clear enough:—Petrum, Johannem, &c, Jacobum *Juſtum Hieroſolymorum Epiſcopum conſtituiſſe.* And *Hegeſippus* his words alſo have the ſame value both with *Euſebius*, *Jerom*, and *Ruffinus* (in his Tranſlation). And indeed μετὰ τῶν conſiſts well with *Euſebius* his πρὸς τῶν, or μετὰ τὰς Ἀποστόλους, and perhaps is rather uſed by *Hegeſippus*, becauſe the Apoſtles, when reſident at *Jeruſalem*, could not be excluded from being Co-governours with, or rather Superiour Governours to, *James*: They having an univerſal Epiſcopacy over all the Churches. Likewiſe it is ſaid to be a thing queſtioned in antiquity: Whether *Ignatius*, or *Evodius*, was the firſt ſucceſſor to the Apoſtles in *Antioch*; or whether *Evodius* at all. (So likewiſe at *Rome*, whether *Clemens* or *Anacletus* ſate firſt after the Apoſtles, or whether *Linus* before both). R. But here is no queſtion made by Antiquity, whether a ſingle perſon in theſe Churches ſucceeded the Apoſtles, which ſufficiently ſerves our purpoſe.

Mr. *Stillingf. Iren.* p. 321.

l. 2. c. 1.

Euſeb. l. 2. c. 22

V. before Sect. 18.

Next, this account alſo *Euſebius* extracts out of the Epiſtles of S. *Ignatius* (who was Biſhop of *Antioch* before S. *John*'s death) concerning his contemporary Biſhops, *circa A. D.* 108. *Quum* Smyrnæ *eſſet, ubi* Polycarpus *erat, ſcripſit unam Epiſtolam* Epheſinæ *Eccleſiæ, factâ* Oneſimi Paſtoris ſui [he calls the Biſhop Paſtor, though

§. 42. *n* 4.

Hiſt. l. 3. c. 31. *By S. *Ignatius* apud *Euſeb.* *A. D.* 108.

in *Epheſus* there were many Presbyters] *mentione*; *& aliam* Magneſianæ *Eccleſiæ*, *ubi &* Damæ Epiſcopi *meminit* [and of two of the Presbyters alſo *Baſſus* and *Appollonius*]; *item aliam Trallenſi Eccleſiæ*, cujus Principem [ſo he calls the Biſhop] *tum temporis* Polybium *fuiſſe commemorat*—and (Chap. 33.) *Cùm vero ultra* Smyrnam *eſſet*, *à* Troade Smyrnæorum *Eccleſiam alloquitur*; *ac ſeparatim* Polycarpo, *qui illi* præerat, *quem tanquam Apoſtolicum virum optimè noverat*, *Antiochenæ Eccleſiæ gregem*, *velut ſincerus & bonus* Paſtor, *commendat.*

§.42.n.5. Again, thus *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Lions*, *A. D.* 180 ‖ gives the Catalogue of the Roman Biſhops, there, ſucceeding *Peter* and *Paul*, till his own times.—*Fundantes & inſtruentes Beati Apoſtoli* [Petrus & Paulus] *Eccleſiam* [Romanam] Lino *Epiſcopatum adminiſtrandæ Eccleſiæ tradiderunt. Hujus* Lini Paulus *in his, quæ ſunt ad* Timotheum, *epiſtolis, meminit. Succedit autem ei* Anacletus *Poſt eum tertio loco ab Apoſtolis Epiſcopatum ſortitur* Clemens. *Qui & vidit ipſos Apoſtolos, & contulit cum eis.*—*Sub hoc* Clemente, *ſcripſit, quæ eſt Romæ, Eccleſia potentiſſimas literas* Corinthiis.—*Huic* Clementi *ſuccedit* Euariſtus, *&c. Nunc duodecimo loco Epiſcopatum ab Apoſtolis habet* Eleutherius. See the like Catalogue in S. *Auſtin*, ep. 165.

* By S. *Irenæus* *A. D.* 180.— ‖ l. 3. c 3.

2 *Tim.* 4. 21.

§.42.n.6. Before *Irenæus*, (Again) *Hegeſippus* apud *Euſebium* l. 4. c. 21. a Chriſtian Writer in *Adrian*'s time ‖ before *A. D.* 140. in relating his travels from *Judæa* to *Rome*, giveth this account of the Biſhops that were in thoſe days. *Se plurimos Epiſcopos, cùm Romæ peregrè proficiſceretur, convenisſe, & eandem apud omnes doctrinam deprendiſſe.* [And, after having made mention of *Clement*'s Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, goeth on] *Eccleſiam* Corinthiorum *in rectâ doctrinâ* ad Primum *uſque* Corinthiorum Epiſcopum *permanſiſſe*; *quibus* [Corinthiis] *cùm Romam navigaret, ſe congreſſum fuiſſe*; *& apud illos multos dies egiſſe*; *Romæ autem conſtitutum, hæſiſſe illic uſque ad* Anicetum [*A. D.* 166.], *Cujus* Diaconus *erat* Eleutherius. [Likely his Arch-Deacon or chief Officer in keeping

* By *Hegeſippus* *A. D.* 140. ‖ *Hieron.* de ſcript. Eccleſ.

keeping and diſpenſing of the Church's ſtock]. Aniceto *huic ſucceſſiſſe* Soterem ; *iſti* Eleutherium. *In ſingulis autem ſucceſſionibus, & ſingulis civitatibus ita habere, ſicut & lex, & Prophetæ, & Dominus prædicant.* [As for the Church of *Jeruſalem* thus he writes.] *Poſtquam* Jacobus Juſtus *Martyrium pertulit*, * Simonem Cleopæ *conſtitutum Epiſcopum, quem omnes ob id prætulerunt, quòd eſſet alter Domini conſobrinus* — * *Eccleſiam illam* [Hieroſol.] *tunc Virginem vocatam, nondum enim fuiſſe vanis Doctrinis corruptam :* * Thebulin *verò, quoniam* non *fuerit conſtitutus* Epiſcopus, *corrumpere illam cœpiſſe.* Here you ſee a ſucceſſion to the Apoſtles in ſingle perſons every where, (at *Corinth* and all) in *Adrian*'s time ; and this dignity then obtained by election, not ſeniority, and ambitiouſly ſought for ; and the Prædeceſſors not differenced from their Succeſſors in the extent of their Authority. Such as *Eleutherius*, ſuch *Anicetus* ; ſuch as *James*, ſuch *Simeon.*

About the ſame time, or not long after *Hegeſippus*, was one *Dionyſius* (after *Primus*) Biſhop of *Corinth*, a famous Writer ; who in his Epiſtle to the Church of *Athens*, ‖ maketh mention of one *Quadratus* formerly their Biſhop, and of *Publius* a Martyr, Biſhop there before him ; and then of *Dionyſius* the Areopagite, as their firſt Biſhop.—In another Epiſtle Gortinenſi *Eccleſiæ* in *Creet*, he commends *Philip* their Biſhop, *eò quod Eccleſia* ipſi concredita *plurimarum virtutum teſtimonio commendabilis haberetur.*—In another *ad Gnoſios*, he exhorts *Pinytus*, their Biſhop, *ne grave ſervandæ caſtitatis onus neceſſariò fratribus* [*i. e.* thoſe of the Clergy] *imponat, ſed multorum ſeſe imbecillitati attemperet.* To whom alſo ſee *Pinytus* his anſwer, in *Euſebius*, to this purpoſe ; that the Church was not always to be fed with Milk. Here you ſee, *Eccleſiam Epiſcopo concreditam* ; *& Epiſcopum onus caſtitatis imponentem fratribus*, i. e. *Presbyteris* ; for you cannot imagine that he enjoined to all the People ſuch cœlibacy. —

§. 42. *n* 7.

†By S. *Dionyſius Corinth.* *A. D.* 170.

‖ Apud *Euſeb.* l. 4. c. 22.

Again ;

§. 42. n. 8.

Again; not long after this *Dionysius, Clemens Alexandrinus*, in the story he relates of the debauch'd young Man, that was reclaimed by S. *John*, hath several passages, shewing Bishops, as superior to Presbyters, to have been settled in the Church in S. *John*'s time. There he saith: — *Quum ex Insulâ Patmo* Ephesum *S.* Johannes *reversus esset, abiisse etiam rogatum ad vicina gentium loca*, ut partim *constitueret* Episcopos, [For several of those *Asian* Churches (except *Ephesus*), to whom S. *John* was our Saviour's Scribe in the *Revelations*, seem also to have been of his Founding before his exile into *Patmos*: as is intimated by *Tertullian*.—*Habemus* (saith he) *& Johannis alumnas Ecclesias* [he speaks of those mentioned in the *Revelations*] *Nam etsi* Apocalypsim *ejus Marcion respuit, Ordo tamen Episcoporum* [the Revelation-Angels] *ad originem recensus, in* Johannem *stabit authorem.* Clemens goes on]—*partim totas Ecclesias componeret*, partim Clerum *ex his, quos Spiritus sanctus indicasset, deligeret.*— and again—*vultu ad eum verso, qui* super cunctos Episcopus *erat constitutus, adolescentem illi, testibus Christo & Ecclesiâ, commendasse*—afterward He saith, *Presbyterum* [so he calleth the Bishop] *adolescentem sibi traditum illuminasse* [i. e. baptized him]; *qui post ad tantam observantiam pervenit, ut eximium illi* [*Episcopus*] *phylacterium, obsignationem sc. Domini, adderet* [i. e. confirmation]: —and afterward — *Age Episcope* [saith S. *John*] *depositum nobis redde, quod ego & Christus tibi, teste Ecclesiâ*, cui præes, *concredidimus. Episcopus primùm obstupuit, calumniam sibi imendi putans propter pecunias, quas non accepisset, nec fidem dare potuit de illis, quæ non habebat.* — Here is, * S. *John*, distinctly, *deligens clerum*; *& constituens Episcopos*; * One person (though called still Presbyter, as well as Bishop, for those names were as then promiscuously used) *super cunctos constitutus Episcopus*; *qui præest Ecclesiæ, qui illuminat, qui obsignat*,—&, *cui concreditæ pecuniæ*, to whom are committed the Church goods. Concerning several of which, how they did appertain to the place of the Bishop, and might not be exercised by others;

* By *Clem. Alexand.* A.D. 190. *Euseb.* l. 3. c. 20.

Contra Marcion. l. 4. c. 5.

others; either not, at all; or not, without delegation from the Biſhop. See below *Tertul. de bapt.* quoted Sect. 50. — *Juſt. Martyr*'s Apology, Sect. 47. n. 1. — and the authorities, Sect. 66. *&c.* and Sect. 70.

Likewiſe, ſee, *apud Euſebium l. 5. c. 22.* the account which *Polycrates*, Biſhop of *Epheſus*, in his Letter to S. *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, gives of the neighbour Biſhops of *Aſia*, that had been in his time: which *Polycrates* being ſixty five years old, when he writ to *Victor*, was born within thirty ſix years after the deceaſe of S. *John*, and numbreth himſelf, (then certainly having a perfect Record of his Predeceſſors) the eighth Biſhop of *Epheſus*. §. 42. *n.* 9.

* By *Polycrates Epiſcop. Eph. A.D.* 190.

Laſtly, (not to trouble you with more) thus ſpeaks *Tertullian*, who lived about *A. D.* 200. of Biſhops made by the Apoſtles in every Church. — *Hoc enim modo Eccleſiæ Apoſtolicæ cenſus ſuos deferunt: * Sicut* Smyrnæorum *eccleſia habens* Polycarpum, *ab* Joanne *conlocatum refert. * Sicut Romanorum*, Clementem *à* Petro *ordinatum edit.* [He, ſuppoſed the ſucceſſor to S. *Peter* there, as *Linus* to S. *Paul*, till, *Linus* and *Cletus* being deceaſed, *Clemens* ſolely governed both Jew and Gentile-Romans, ſee Dr. *Hammond Schiſ. c. 4. Sect. 11.*]: *proinde utique & cæteræ* [*Eccleſiæ*] *exhibent, quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatum conſtitutos, Apoſtolici ſeminis traduces, habeant.* This from Sect. 42. *n.* 2. Concerning ſuch Governors preſiding in other Churches, as did in *Creet* and *Epheſus*, gathered out of *Church-ſtory*. §. 42. *n.* 10.

* By *Tertullian. A. D.* 200. *De Præſcript.*

Thirdly; we gather the ſame Church-government to have been in other Churches, as was in *Epheſus* and *Creet*, from our Saviour's Epiſtle to the ſeven Churches of *Aſia*. (*Rev.* 2.) Which Epiſtle though it handleth matter concerning the whole body of thoſe Churches, and therefore ſpeaketh ſometimes in the plural, as in that verſe much quoted by the Presbyterians, *Rev.* 2. 24. [*unto you I ſay and unto the reſt in* Thyatira] (which, if it meaneth not [unto the reſt of you in *Thyatira* I ſay:] as *Diodate* renders it; and if the [*καὶ*] ſhould not be omitted, as it is in §. 43. 3.

ſome

ſome Greek Copies; let ὑμῖν be underſtood of the Clergy, if they pleaſe), yet it is directed only to the ſeven Angels of thoſe Churches. Now of theſe Angels, 1. our Engliſh Presbyterians (Anſwer in the Iſle of *Wight*, *Oct.* 3. *p.* 3.) do grant, they were ſuch as had power of Governing of the Churches, and of exerciſing cenſures; and 2. *Blondel*, as likewiſe before him *Cartwright*, *Reynolds*, *Beza*, do further grant, that they were ſingle perſons; namely the *Præpoſiti* and προεσῶτες *Presbyteriorum* (ſee *Blondels* words below §. 79.) and 3. then the forecited teſtimonies do clearly ſhew; that theſe ſingle perſons, at that time, were * *Timothy* (or his ſucceſſor) at *Epheſus*; and * *Polycarp* undoubtedly at *Smyrna*; (who in this Epiſtle receives from our Saviour a great elogy, and ſutable to his Martyrdom, deſcribed in *Euſeb. l.* 4. *c.* 14.) and 4. from this we may preſume, that the like ſingle perſons, and of the ſame authority, preſided alſo in the other five Churches, at the writing of this Epiſtle: Both 1. becauſe we ſee in this Epiſtle the Angels of *Epheſus* and *Smyrna* no way made different from, or more ſingle than, any of the reſt: Nor they only deſcribed ſingle ſtars, and the reſt Conſtellations. And 2. becauſe we find *Ignatius* preſided as Biſhop in *Antioch*; and *Papias* (Johannis *auditor* & Polycarpi *ſodalis*, as *Irenæus* ſaith of him) as Biſhop at *Hierapolis*, a Church of S. *Paul*'s founding, at the ſame time. And 3. becauſe alſo in ſeveral of the foreſaid Churches we find, out of authentick Records, a ſingle perſon named as Biſhop thereof, if not punctually, at that time when S. *John* penned theſe Epiſtles, yet preſently after it. So one *Oneſimus* is named by S. *Ignatius* as Biſhop of *Epheſus* when he writ his Epiſtle to that Church, *i. e.* within eight or nine years after S. *John*'s deceaſe. And the Biſhop at the ſame time of *Philadelphia*, though not named, yet is much commended by the ſame *Ignatius* (as alſo the Angel of that See was by our Saviour *Rev.* 3. 7.) in his Epiſtle *ad Philadelphios*. In, or near to, S. *John*'s time alſo was *Carpus* Biſhop of *Thyatira*; as ſaith the antient *Ro-*

Apolog. Hieron. præfat. p. 6.
See the King's final anſwer *p.* 20.
Reyn againſt *Hart. c.* 8.
Beza in Apoc. 2. 1.
Apud Euſeb. *l.* 3. *c.* 31. … *c.* 36.
Coloſſ. 4. 17.
In April 13.

man

man Martyrologe; and ſuffered Martyrdom at the ſame time with *Polycarp*, as ſaith *Euſebius*. Near to S. *John*'s time alſo was *Sagaris* Biſhop of *Laodicea*, mentioned both by *Polycrates*, and by *Melito*, *apud Euſeb. l. 4. c. 25.*— and *l. 5. c. 22.* Laſtly, not very remote from S. *John*'s time, was *Melito*, a great Writer of thoſe days, the Biſhop of *Sardis*. See *Euſeb. l. 4. c. 25.* *l. 4. c. 14.*

CHAP. II.

HAving thus ſeen, how ſingle perſons are, every where, named to have ſucceeded the Apoſtles with ſome preeminency: next, we may diſcover, out of the antienteſt Writings of the Church, concerning the reſt of theſe ſingle perſons, as we do concerning two of them, *Timothy* and *Titus*, out of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, that they had ſome ſuperiority not only of Preſidency or place, but of authority alſo, over the Presbyteries. For which ſee firſt S. *Ignatius*, (who ſuffered Martyrdom within nine years of the deceaſe of S. *John*) in many places of his Epiſtles, a very clear witneſs of this matter; who, (as *Euſebius* obſerves) upon many Hereſies then newly ſprung up, exhorts the Churches to adhere to the Apoſtolical Traditions, and ſtrictly to obey their guides, (the Biſhop and the Presbyters), that ſo they might continue Orthodox in their Opinions. In which Epiſtles he often names the three diſtinct Orders or Degrees (call them which you pleaſe) of Biſhops, Presbyters or Presbytery, and Deacons: and, in moſt of them, alſo names him, who is the Biſhop of the Church, that he writeth to, (as alſo in *Epiſt. ad Romanos*, he ſtileth himſelf Biſhop of *Syria*, and Paſtor of the Church in *Syria* [*i. e.* not the prime Presbyter of *Antioch*, but the Metropolitan of the Churches in *Syria*]) exhorting, that all, Presbyters, as well as People, ſhould be ſubject to the Biſhop, and nothing in the Church done without him: the

§.44.*n.*1.

That theſe Biſhops were expreſſed to be ſuperior to the other Presbyters, not only in precedency or dignity, but in Office and Authority, by the Writers of thoſe firſt times.

A. D. 109. *Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 3. c.* 32.

V. Sect. 42.*n.*4.

people to be ſubject to him, as to the ſupreme, and to the Presbyters, as to the inferior, Church-Officers; and ſo we find him, when, in the diſtinguiſhing of theſe two Offices, he compares the Presbyters to the Apoſtles, or the Presbytery to the Apoſtolick Colledge or Conſiſtory, comparing the Biſhop to Chriſt, or alſo to God, the head and ſupreme Governour of the Church, or alſo of the Univerſe: when he compares Presbyters to the Law of Chriſt, comparing Biſhops, ſomething higher, to the Grace of God: As he makes Chriſt to be the mind of the Father, ſo making Biſhops to be the mind of Chriſt: and, as Chriſt in all things followed God, ſo that Chriſtians ought to follow the Biſhop. To ſet you down a few of them. *Ad Magneſios* in Biſhop *Uſher*'s old *Latin* Copy agreeing with *Iſ. Voſſius* his *Greek*, he ſaith thus,—*Vos decet non co-uti ætate Epiſcopi*; [not treat, too familiarly, with him] *ſed, ſecundùm virtutem Dei Patris, omnem reverentiam ei tribuere, ſicut agnovi & ſanctos Presbyteros.*—*Ad* Smyrnenſ.—*Omnes Epiſcopum ſequimini, ut Jeſus Chriſtus Patrem, & Presbyterium ut Apoſtolos, Diaconos autem revereamini ut Dei mandatum. Nullus ſine Epiſcopo aliquid operetur eorum quæ conveniunt in Eccleſiam.*—*Illa firma gratiarum actio* [Euchariſtia] *reputetur, quæ ſub ipſo eſt; vel quam utique ipſe conceſſerit. Ubi utique apparet Epiſcopus, illic multitudo ſit, quemadmodum utique ubi eſt Chriſtus Jeſus, illic Catholica Eccleſia. Non licitum eſt ſine Epiſcopo neque baptizare, neque* Agapen *facere, ſed, quod utique ille probaverit, hoc eſt Deo beneplacitum, ut ſtabile ſit & firmum omne quod agitur. Honorans Epiſcopum à Deo honoratus. Qui occultum ab Epiſcopo aliquid operatur, Diabolo præſtat obſequium.*—Ad Epheſ.—*Concurrite ſententiæ Dei; etenim Jeſus Chriſtus, incomparabile noſtrum vivere, Patris* [γνώμῃ] *ſententia, ut, & ipſi* [*Epiſcopi*] *ſecundum terræ fines* [ὁρισθέντες] *determinati, Jeſu Chriſti ſententia ſunt; unde decet vos concurrere Epiſcopi ſententiæ.*—Ad Magneſios, *In concordiâ Dei ſtudete omnia operari, præſidente Epiſcopo in loco Dei, & Presbyteris, in loco conſeſſionis Apoſtolorum, & Diaconis habentibus*

habentibus creditam [διακονιαν] *miniſtrationem Jeſu Chriſti.*—*Ad* Tralleſios.—*Omnes revereantur Diaconos ut mandatum Jeſu Chriſti, & Epiſcopum ut Jeſum Chriſtum exiſtentem filium patris, Presbyteros autem ut* [συνέδριον] *concilium Dei &* [σύνδεσμον] *conjunctionem Apoſtolorum.* —Again, *Valete in Jeſu Chriſto, ſubjecti Epiſcopo ut Dei mandato, ſimiliter & Presbyterio.*—Ad Magneſ. He commends *Sotion* the Deacon—*Quoniam ſubjectus eſt Epiſcopo, ut Gratiæ Dei, & Presbyterio, ut Legi Jeſu Chriſti.* Here who ſees not, that if Presbyters, by this Father, are made the Apoſtle's ſucceſſors, becauſe reſembled to the Apoſtles, Biſhops are alſo in the ſame manner made the ſucceſſors, of Chriſt, *i. e.* of the primary Apoſtle, becauſe reſembled to Chriſt; and put in the ſame rank, as the Apoſtles themſelves are, for Chriſt's ſucceſſors; and particularly in the laſt expreſſion, whether *Gratia* and *Lex* be compared, or *Deus* and *Chriſtus*, as ſent from God, who ſeeth not, that the two firſt are the ſuperior; and that *Gratia* as well as *Lex* hath a divine Original? Much amiſs therefore muſt their conceit be, who would make the Presbyters, in their being compared to the *Apoſtles*, and to *Lex Chriſti*, of Divine inſtitution; but the Biſhop, compared to *Chriſt* himſelf and to *Gratia Dei*, which vivificates *Lex Chriſti*, not ſo; and who ſay; that *Ignatius is ſo earneſt in requiring obedience to the Biſhop, as* Gratia Dei, i. e. *a favour of God to the Church for preventing Schiſms and preſerving unity, but not on the account of divine inſtitution; but yet that this Father owneth the Council of Presbyters as of divine Inſtitution; and thus, that* Ignatius *and* Jerome *may be eaſily reconciled to one another.* Your judgement to this needs no reply. But will not thus alſo, S. *Jerom's poſtea* and *paulatim, & toto orbe decretum*, &c. † be made to precede *Ignatius* his days, who was contemporary with S. *John?*

V. Mr. Stilling. p. 308, 309.

† *Vid.* §. 87.

Here then, in ſo clear a Teſtimony, the oppoſite party having no way left them to interpret this Father's words agreeably to their Tenent, are neceſſitated to deny theſe

§. 44. *n.* 2.

writings to be genuine; and this (as the King ſaith, in
Octo. 6 his Reply to them at the Iſle of *Wight*) *without any regard either of Ingenuity or Truth.* The reaſon of which ſharp cenſure of ſo mild a Prince, that you may the better diſcern, you muſt know, that there have heretofore gone abroad in the World Copies of theſe Epiſtles of *Ignatius* very corrupt (though the Interpolator, I ſuppoſe, chiefly intended a Paraphraſe;) * in which could not be found the many places which the Fathers had quoted out of them, at leaſt, in the ſame words: and * concerning the falſification of which *Vedelius*, Biſhop *Uſher*, and others have written much. But of late *Iſaac Voſſius* (one of that part of the Reformed Church, that is governed by Presbyters) met with an antient *Greek* Manuſcript of theſe Epiſtles in the *Medicean* Library at *Florence*; and, about the ſame time, Biſhop *Uſher* (uſing ſome diligent ſearch, becauſe he perceived ſome Engliſh later Writers to quote *Ignatius* his words otherwiſe, than the former Copies had them) found alſo two old Latin Copies here in *England*; all theſe three, (that *Greek* one of *Voſſius*'s, and theſe two *Latin* ones of Biſhop *Uſher*'s), * being different from the former Copies; and * agreeing one with another: and free from the ſuſpected Interpolations in the former: and laſtly * ſuch, wherein are found all the places; quoted by the Fathers out of theſe Epiſtles, in the ſame expreſſions, which they uſed. Though indeed, as Mr. *Thorndyke* well obſerves,

See Dr. *Ham.* vindic. *c.* 3. Sect. 3. *n.* 16. Sect. 5. & notas *Jſ. Voſſ. in Ep. Ignat.* & *Blondel. in præf.* Right of Church. p. 133.

—had we none but the old Copy; yet we might confidently appeal to the common ſence of any Man not faſcinated with prejudice, how that can be imagined to be always foiſted in, which is the perpetual ſubject of all his Epiſtles; dwelling only upon the avoiding of Hereſie and Schiſm; and the avoiding of Schiſm every where inculcated to conſiſt in this, that without the Biſhop nothing be done, and all with the advice of the Presbyters.

§. 44. *n.* 3. Now, out of theſe Copies it is, that theſe Teſtimonies are taken, ſo clear for Biſhops: which Teſtimonies (again) being out of the moſt prime antiquity, utterly decide

decide this Controverſie. What is done here by the diſſentient party to avoid a conqueſt? *Blondel* (who probably had written his Book againſt Epiſcopacy, as alſo *Salmaſius*, before a ſight of theſe later true Copies) granteth in his *Preface*, that thoſe things, which the Fathers have quoted, are here to be found; accuſeth not *Voſſius*, or Biſhop *Uſher* of any compact, or deceit; but ſaith ſtill, * that theſe Epiſtles, as we receive them from *Voſſius* and Biſhop *Uſher*, were forged after *Ignatius*'s time; but yet before thoſe times, wherein theſe Fathers writ, that quoted them: and * that theſe Fathers alſo were deceived in them. Forged therefore, he ſaith, they were, A. D. 280. But yet it ſeemeth, that they muſt be forged long before this: *viz.* * before A. D. 226. ſince *Origen* (Hom. 6. in *Luc.*) quoted ſome words, out of them: nay further; * before A. D. 180. ſince *Irenæus*, in his fifth Book, doth quote ſome words out of them; which *Irenæus* lived A. D. 180. But yet, if *Salmaſius*'s Judgment may be taken, they were forged before this; for he ſaith, p. 253. *Epiſtolæ illæ natæ & ſuppoſitæ videntur* circa initium, aut medium ſecundi ſæculi, *quo tempore primus ſingularis Epiſcopatus ſupra Presbyteratum introductus fuit.* Forged, then, they muſt be in the very days of the Author; For *circa initium ſecundi ſæculi*, was the very time, when *Ignatius* himſelf is aſſerted to have written them: namely, about A. D. 108. near the time of his Martyrdom. And, for this forging, *Blondel* brings certain Arguments, ſome of which have been alſo, ſince, repeated by Mr. *Owen* in his Preface to the *Saint's perſeverance*. But to theſe Dr. *Hammond* hath returned anſwers, in his diſſertation on this Subject, as yet unconfuted, to whom I refer you.

Apol. Hieron. Præfat. p. 39, &c. and Dr. *Hammond*'s anſwer to *Owen*, p. 21.

Walo Meſſalinus c. 4.

As for ſome words, found in thoſe Epiſtles, which are thought unſuting to *Ignatius*'s days; neither perhaps will they better ſute with Mr. *Blondel*'s times about A. D. 280, *&c.* Yet *Salmaſius*, it ſeems, thought, that they ſuted well enough with the times not diſtant from *Ignatius* at the moſt above 40 Years, in his gueſs, that the forging

§. 44. *n.* 4.

forging of that Book was *circa medium ſecundæ ætatis.* And, for the mention of Σιγὴ [λόγος ὐκ ἀπὸ Σιγῆς προσελθόνλος. in *ep. ad Magneſios*] a word belonging to the *Valentinian* Hereſie; which Hereſie roſe after *Ignatius* his Deceaſe; if you compare what *Irenæus* ſaith, *lib. primo* in the beginning of the firſt *Chap.* and what he ſaith in the beginning and in the end of the fifth *Chap.* you may find, Βύθος and Σιγὴ to have been named by the *Gnoſticks*, for the two Grand Parents of the Univerſe, before *Valentinus*; and that *Valentinus*, diſſenting from the former *Gnoſticks*, would have theſe prime Parents rather to be, Ἄρρητος and Σιγή.

§.44.n.5. But, * our Men here at home (ſee their two *Anſwers* at the Iſle of *Wight*; and their *Appendix* to *Jus divinum Miniſt. Anglic. propoſ.* 3. p. 108, *&c.*) without any mentioning, or diſtinguiſhing between, the former Copies, and theſe latter, do ſtill cry down the Epiſtles as corrupted or feigned. * They urge *Vedelius* ſtill, and Biſhop *Uſher*, as proving it. R. But Biſhop *Uſher* and *Vedelius* ſaid, or proved, this only of the former Copies; not of theſe now preſſed: which later Copies Biſhop *Uſher* juſtifies. * They plead ſtill, that the Father's quotations are not found in thoſe Epiſtles: R. But it is in the former Copies, that they are not found. * They produce ſeveral places in the Epiſtles, faulty, and unjuſtifiable; R. But, of eight, which they urge, they have taken ſeven out of the corrupt Copies; and the eighth place is that I cited but now; *Ad Smyrnæos*; Judge you how faulty. * They require Dr. *Hammond* to anſwer Biſhop *Uſher*'s Objections, R. But ſuch Objections as are made againſt the old Copies. Is not this (as the King ſaith) *without any regard*, &c? *But*, if theſe Epiſtles be acknowledged authentick, then (as I ſaid) the whole cauſe is yielded; for his writings come too early for S. *Jerom*'s *poſtea*, as they interpret it.

See Dr. *Hammond* Vind. of diſſert. p. 152.

§. 45. Thus much of S. *Ignatius* his Teſtimony. Now, to proceed to ſome others of the Antients, that lived not long after him. '[In ſeveral of whom *Blondel*

'acknow-

acknowledgeth alſo a diſtinction of Biſhops, as well from Presbyters, as from Deacons, to be found. For, * of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who writ his *Stromata* not long after 190, he ſaith; *Chriſtiani cleri in Epiſcopos, Presbyteros, Diaconos*, ex Eccleſiarum uſu natam, *diſtributionem admittebat.* By which alſo he muſt grant the ſame diſtribution, *ex uſu Eccleſiarum*, to have been in the times of *Irenæus*, who was Martyred A.D. 192. the ſame then muſt be ſaid of *Irenæus* as of *Clemens.* * Of *Tertullian*, the antienteſt *Latin* Writer, living about A. D. 200. he ſaith,—Communi uſu receptam, *diſtinctionem Ordinis in Epiſcopos, Presbyteros, & Diaconos, apertè tuetur.* * Of *Origen. Is tria in clero capitum genera* (conſuetudini Eccleſiarum favens) *admittere paſſim videtur.* 'Tis in vain now to name his conceſſions concerning thoſe Fathers that followed them.]

A. D. 190. *Apol. p.* 36.

A. D. 192.

p. 38.

A. D. 200. p. 39.

After this confeſſion of *Blondel.* Amongſt theſe Antients ſee, in the firſt place, that expreſſion of *Pius* Biſhop of *Rome*, A. D. 146. who writing to *Juſtus* the new elected *Biſhop of Vienna* after *Verus*, Veri *loco à fratribus conſtitutum, & collobio Epiſcoporum* [it ſeems, that, then, the *Biſhops* had a diſtinct habit] *veſtitum*; he giveth him this admonition.—*Te Presbyteri & Diaconi, non ut majorem, ſed ut miniſtrum Chriſti, obſervent.* Which place by reaſon of the expreſſion [*non ut majorem*] *Blondel* produceth (one would think in jeſt) to ſhew *Biſhops* at that time to be *jure Divino* equal to Presbyters: but then will it not ſhew *Biſhops*, on the ſame manner equal to Deacons too; [*Te Diaconi non ut majorem*] or indeed inferior to both; *ſed ut miniſtrum*? but *Luke* 22. 26, 27. will ſufficiently explicate to you the meaning of this good Counſel; and that *Pius* gave it to him, as being, by his ſuperiority, in danger of loſing his humility.—

§. 46.

A. D. 146. *Pius* Ep. 2. an undoubted Epiſtle, in *Bibl. Patrum, Tom.* 3. *fol.* 15.

Next; ſee the narration of S. *Juſtin* Martyr concerning the cuſtoms of the Chriſtians, in his Apology for them to *Antoninus* the Emperor, written about A. D. 150.—

§. 47. *n.* 1.

A. D. 150. 150.—*Postea* [προεστῶτι] —[a Title, then, belonging to the *Bi*shop, as you may see in the antient Epistle of *Dionysius Bi*shop of *Corinth* to the Church of *Athens*, calling *Publius* their *Bi*shop τὸν προεστῶτα ἀυτῶν. *apud Euseb.* 4. c. 22.] *Antistiti, seu Præposito fratrum panis & aquæ & vini poculum offertur; quibus ille acceptis, laudem & gloriam rerum universarum Patri*, &c, *& gratiarum actionem, pro eo, quod nos donis hisce suis dignatus sit, prolixe exequitur*, &c. [see the service in *Clem. Constit.* l. 8. muchwhat according to this description].—*Præsidens verò postquam gratiarum actionem perfecit*, &c, *qui apud nos vocantur Diaconi distribuunt unicuique præsantium, ut participet eum* εὐχαριστηθέντα *panem, vinum & equam; & ad absentes perferunt.*—Again—*Solis, quod dicitur, die, omnium, qui vel in oppidis vel ruri degunt, in eundem locum conventus fit, & commentaria Apostolorum, aut scripta Prophetarum, quoad tempus fert, leguntur. Deinde, lectore quiescente, Præsidens orationem, quâ populum instruit, & ad imitationem tam pulchrarum rerum adhortatur*, [it seems speaking upon some Text,] *habet. Sub hâc consurgimus communiter omnes, & precationes profundimus.—Precibus peractis; panis offertur, & vinum, & aqua, & Præpositus, itidem, preces & gratiarum actiones fundit*, &c, *& unicuique distributio & participatio rerum Eucharistizatarum fit; absentibus quoque per Diaconos mittitur.* [*Absentibus* (*i. e.*) *to the* sick, or otherwise hindered from coming to Church; or also, in some times, sent from the Mother Church and Bishop, to other Churches, and to *Bi*shops and Presbyters officiating elsewhere, (though these also, in those Churches, celebrating the Eucharist), as a *tessera* of their communion one with another in Christ, though divided in place. See *Irenæus* his Epistle to *Victor apud Euseb.* l 5. c. 23. —— *Innocent ad Decent.* c. 5.—*Concil. Laodic.* c. 14.]. *Cæterùm qui opulentiores sunt, pro arbitrio quisque suo, quod visum est, contribuunt, & quod ita colligitur apud præpositum deponitur: atque ille inde opitulatur pupillis*, &c; *& peregrè advenientibus hospitibus; & (ut simpliciter*

citer dicam) *indigentium is omnium Curator eſt.*—I have ſet it down the more at large, that you might ſee the very-antient manner of the Church's publick ſervice and celebration of the Euchariſt. That, which I would note out of it, is; that here is mention of a ſingle Preſident, and that in the Mother Church, (whence the Euchariſt was ſent *ad abſentes*) (call him *Epiſcopus*, or *Primus Presbyterorum*, as you pleaſe), * to whom, and not to a ſociety of Presbyters or Preſidents, are committed, the charities of the People, and the ſtock of the Church; (after the ſame manner, as it was at firſt to the Apoſtles *Acts* 4. 34.): and * who was the Curator of the diſpoſal thereof, for, relief of the needy, hoſpitality toward ſtrangers, &c. And this agrees well, ∆ with what was produced before §. 42. n. 8. out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, concerning S. *John*'s Biſhop; and ∆ with the Canons and common known practice of the following times: wherein the Biſhop only was entruſted with the Church's Revenue, and Contributions of the Charitable, ſee below §. 70.

As for the mention, here made by *Juſtin*, of Deacons, beſides the προεστὼς, and none made of Presbyters, the reaſon is; not, becauſe there were not preſent, in this Church, Presbyters alſo, beſides him who officiated; but becauſe the Deacons were they, to whom this ſervice, *diſtribuendi panem*, &c, appertained, (in which employment alſo they ſerved the Presbyter, when officiating in the Biſhop's abſence), as you may ſee in the peruſing of any Antient Liturgy. §.47.n.2.

See, in the next place, *Irenæus* a Writer in the ſecond Age, *who*, in arguing againſt the *Valentinians*, who ſaid that the Apoſtles did not write, but only diſcloſed to ſome choice perſons in ſecret, the things which thoſe Hereticks taught, diſcourſeth thus, *l.* 3. *c.* 3.—*Habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apoſtolis inſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi in Eccleſiis, & ſucceſſores eorum uſque ad nos; qui nihil tale docuerunt, quale ab his deliratur. Etenim, ſi recondita myſteria ſciſſent Apoſtoli, quæ ſeorſim & latenter ab* §.48.n.1.

reliquis perfectos docebant, his vel maximè traderent ea, quibus etiam ipſas Eccleſias committebant: valdè enim perfectos, & irreprehenſibiles in omnibus, eos volebant eſſe, quos & ſucceſſores relinquebant, ſuum ipſorum locum magiſterii *tradentes*, &c. Upon which, he giveth a Catalogue of thoſe, who had been the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, *Peter* and *Paul*, in the Church of *Rome*. —— *Fundantes igitur, & inſtruentes Beati Apoſtoli*, [Petrus & Paulus], *Eccleſiam* [Romæ], Lino *Epiſcopatum adminiſtrandæ Eccleſiæ tradiderunt*, &c: as is ſet down before §. 42. n. 9. So (a little after) he urgeth that neither *Polycarpus*, made, by the Apoſtles, Biſhop of *Smyrna*, nor his ſucceſſors, received any ſuch doctrine.—— Polycarpus *autem non ſolùm ab Apoſtolis edoctus, & converſatus cum multis ex iis, qui Dominum noſtrum viderunt*, ſed etiam *ab Apoſtolis in* Aſiâ, *in eâ, quæ eſt* Smyrnis, *Eccleſia*, conſtitutus Epiſcopus; *quem & nos vidimus*, &c.— So he ſaith, Epiſtle to *Victor* apud *Euſeb.* l. 5. c. 23. of the ſame *Roman* Biſhops, that they did *rerum habenis ante nos potiri*—& *præeſſe Eccleſiæ, cui nunc præſidet* Victor. See more matter ſutable to this in his *l.* 4. *c.* 43, 44.

§.48.*n.*2. Here firſt; we ſee *Linus*, *Clemens*, &c, ſucceeding one another from Apoſtolical Inſtitution.—2ly. We ſee

1. 2. theſe expreſſions * concerning them; that they are called *Succeſſores Apoſtolorum*; &, *quibus Eccleſias committebant, ſuum ipſorum locum magiſterii illis tradentes*,—& ——*habemus annumerare eos*; and, * concerning *Polycarpus*;——that he was, *non ſolùm ab Apoſtolis edoctus, ſed etiam conſtitutus Smyrnenſis Epiſcopus.* Now; if all comes only to this, that they had the ſame authority and place and ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, as all other Presbyters throughout the World had, why were not, without ſo much circum-locution, Presbyters named in general? But, if we allow theſe perſons, from the Apoſtle's times, to have had ſome precedency at leaſt in theſe Churches over the other Presbyters; then, how can we make them to have leſs in theſe Churches, than *Timothy* and

and *Titus* had in their's: all deriving their Commiſſion from the ſame Founders, the Apoſtles?——But, 3ly. Since *Valentinus* himſelf was a Presbyter, and turned Heretick, becauſe he miſſed of a Biſhoprick, why ſhould *Irenæus* argue againſt him, that the Apoſtles, to theſe, *his vel maximè, traderent recondita myſteria, quibus etiam ipſas Eccleſias committebant*, rather than to *Valentinus*, (a Presbyter as well as they,) if the Church were no otherwiſe committed to them, than to him?—— 4ly. In this ſucceſſion of the perſons named, there ſeemeth to be the ſame Authority and quality of them all; * as much in *Linus* as in *Eleutherius*; or rather the more in thoſe, whom the Apoſtles themſelves ordained: again, * the ſame authority in the *Roman* ſucceſſion, as in that of *Lyons*, where *Irenæus* ſucceeded. But the laſt perſons of theſe lines had a clear ſuperiour authority to other Presbyters, and were Biſhops taken in the modern notion; namely *Irenæus*; and *Eleutherius*, and *Victor*, his contemporaries. See * for *Irenæus*, what *Euſebius* ſaith. Hiſt. *l.* 5. *c.* 21. *Paræcias* [a Biſhop's Dioceſs then ſo called] *per Galliam* Irenæus *moderatus eſt* [he an Archbiſhop there]. And *c.* 23.—— *Qui præerat fratribus per Galliam*:—and ſee the Letter of the *Gallicane* Church to *Eleutherius*, where they uſe this, as a title of Honour, concerning *Irenæus*, ſent by them as their Legate to *Eleutherius*, that he was Presbyter *Eccleſiæ* Lugdunenſis, [i. e. *qui Eccleſiæ præerat*].—And * for *Victor*, who ſurely could be no leſs than *Irenæus*, ſee what authority he uſed, not only over his own, but the *Aſian* Churches, in *Euſeb.* l. 5. c. 21, 23, 25. As for ſuch Biſhops of the Churches their being, by *Irenæus* and other Writers of thoſe times, not unfrequently called by the name of *Presbyters*, beſides that (ordinarily) they were not called ſo without ſome note of diſtinction added; as; *Presbyter talis Eccleſiæ*—*Presbyter qui præeſt*, &c. (See below §. 100.), it will be no argument, for equalizing them with other ſingle Presbyters, ſo long as *Victor* and *Irenæus*, who are acknowledged Superior in Authority,

3. *Tertul. adverſ. Valent. c.* 4.

4.

Apud. *Euſeb.* l. 5. c. 4.

yet bare alſo the ſame name of *Presbyters* as the former. Therefore *Salmaſius* freely confeſſeth; — *Presbyteri vocantur Romani* Pontifices, *etiam poſtquam Epiſcopatus apicem ſupra Presbyteros conſecuti ſunt ſinguli in toto orbe Epiſcopi.* But hardly will the name of Biſhops, any where, be found in thoſe times given to ſingle Presbyters.

Walo Meſſalin. p. 265.

§. 49. After *Irenæus*, ſee his contemporary *Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. 6.* * mentioning three degrees of Clergy: — *Nam hic quoque in Eccleſiâ* [προκοπαὶ] *progreſſiones*, or *proceſſus Epiſcoporum, Presbyterorum, Diaconorum, ſunt imitationes gloriæ Angelicæ.* — And * mentioning, a little before, προτοκαθεδρία, which, I think, none will apply to all the Presbyters, but to one, the chief of them — and (*Stromat.* l. 3.) * deſcribing a Biſhop, one ſet over all the whole Church, — *Jam Epiſcopos* (*inquit Apoſtolus*) *oportet conſtitui, qui, ex domo propriâ, toti quoque Eccleſiæ præeſſe ſint meditati*: and laſtly, that he held the ſame preſidency of Biſhops, which was in his own time, to have been alſo in the Apoſtle S. *John*'s, ſee the ſtory forerelated §. 42. n. 8.

§. 50. Next: ſee *Tertullian* in the beginning of the third Age (*de Præſcrip.* c. 36.) affirming, * the Apoſtle's chairs to remain ſtill in his time. — *Percurre Eccleſias Apoſtolicas, apud quas ipſæ adhuc Cathedræ Apoſtolorum ſuis locis præſidentur.* — *Proxima eſt tibi* Achaia? *Habes* Corinthum. *Si non longè es à* Macedoniâ, *habes* Philippos, *habes* Theſſalonicenſes. *Si potes in* Aſiam *tendere, habes* Epheſum, *&c.* and * theſe chairs to be poſſeſſed, not by a whole Presbytery, but one ſingle perſon ſtill; ſee *de præſc.* c. 11. cited before §. 42. n. 10. — *Eccleſia Smyrnæorum habens* Polycarpum; *Romanorum*, Clementem, *&c.* Who ſpeaketh thus alſo of theſe perſon's ſuperior authority to Presbyters (*de bapt.* c. 7.), — *Dandi quidem Baptiſmum jus habet ſummus Sacerdos, qui eſt Epiſcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi: non tamen ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter honorem Eccleſiæ, quo ſalvo ſalva pax eſt.* — *Alioquin, etiam Laicis jus eſt.* — And after — *Quanto magis Laicis diſciplina*

diſciplina modeſtiæ, & verecundiæ incumbit [in forbearing to baptize, where no caſe of neceſſity], *cum ea majoribus* [*Presbyteris & Diaconis*] *competat, ne ſibi aſſumant dicatum Epiſcopis officium Epiſcopatus. Æmulatio Schiſmatum mater eſt.* It is ſaid here, *propter honorem Eccleſiæ*; becauſe Baptiſme, though valid when done by a Lay-man, yet was by our Lord, for the Churches honour and peace, committed only to certain Church-men of higher note, originally and primarily; namely to the Apoſtles; and by them, to Biſhops. *V.* below §. 104.

After *Tertullian*, ſee *Origen.* 2. *Hom. in Num.* —— *Putaſne, qui Sacerdotio funguntur*, &c, *agere omnia, quæ illo ordine digna ſunt? Similiter & Diaconi*, &c, *& unde eſt, quod ſæpè audimus blaſphemare homines, & dicere. Ecce qualis Epiſcopus; aut qualis Presbyter; vel qualis Diaconus:* Here is a diſtinction of the three ſeveral degrees of Clergy. And ſee *Hom.* 16. in *Mat.* 21. 12. —— *Epiſcopi & Presbyteri, quibus creditæ ſunt Cathedræ, qui tradunt Eccleſias* [i. e. by Presbyters electing, and Biſhops ordaining, the Biſhop] *quibus non oportet, & conſtituunt principes* [Eccleſiæ], *quos conſtituere non expedit, ipſi ſunt qui vendunt columbas.*--*&* 7. *Hom. in Hierem.*--*Potentes potenter tormenta patientur. Plus à me* [*Presbytero*] *exigetur, quàm à Diacono, plus à diacono, quàm à Laico; Qui verò totius Eccleſiæ arcem obtinet* [*Epiſcopus*] *pro omni Eccleſiâ reddet rationem*; Here is the ſuperiority of the Biſhop over the reſt. §. 51.

Thus *Origen*; who ſuffered much from *Demetrius* then Biſhop of *Alexandria*. Which Biſhop ſharply reprehended the Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* and *Cæſarea*, Δ for ordaining *Origen* Presbyter (who was then departed from *Alexandria*) when an *Eunuch*; and Δ for ſuffering him to teach in their preſence, before he was made Presbyter; and which Biſhop afterward excommunicated him for his errors. *Euſeb.* Hiſt. 6. c. 7. 19. *Hieron.* l. 2. *in Ruffin.*

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

§. 52. That the Biſhops of the following ages, who are granted, by all, Superior in authority to Presbyters, were held to be of our Lords, or of Apoſtolical, inſtitution and ſucceſſion, by the Fathers of thoſe times.

IT is needleſs to ſhew, any further, out of later Fathers, the authority of Biſhops to have been ſuperior to Presbyters in their own times. For who, with any face, can deny this? But this may be to purpoſe; to ſhew you out of them, this authority of Biſhops (ſuperior to Presbyters) which was practiſed in their times, to have been held by them of Apoſtolical, or yet higher, of our Lord's, inſtitution, and ſo of Apoſtolical ſucceſſion.

§. 53. For this, then, ſee firſt S. *Cyprian*, Ep. 27. *Lapſis* ſlighting his authority, as touching their reconcilement.——*Dominus noſter, cujus præcepta metuere & obſervare debemus, Epiſcopi honorem & Eccleſiæ ſuæ rationem diſponens dicit* Petro; *Ego tibi dico, quia tu es* Petrus; *& ſuper illam Petram edificabo*, &c. Inde per temporum & ſucceſſionum vices, Epiſcoporum ordinatio *& Eccleſiæ ratio decurrit, ut Eccleſia ſuper Epiſcopos conſtituatur, & omnis actus Eccleſiæ per eoſdem præpoſitos gubernetur. Cùm hoc itaque* divinâ lege fundatum *ſit, miror quoſdam, audaci temeritate, ſic mihi ſcribere voluiſſe*, &c. Surely here the Father ſpeaks of ſuch authority, as himſelf then exerciſed, that it was *divinâ lege fundata.* ——So Ep. 68. —— He calls the ordination of a Biſhop, *ſub populi aſſiſtentis conſcientiâ, traditionem divinam, & Apoſtolicam obſervationem:* —— and inſtanceth in that election of a Biſhop, *Act.* 1. 15. —— *Quando de ordinando in locum* Judæ *Epiſcopo*, Petrus *ad plebem loquitur*, &c. ——And *Ep.* 65. concerning a Deacon reproaching his Biſhop:—— *Meminiſſe* (ſaith he) *Diaconi debent, quoniam Apoſtolos*,

i. e.

i. e. *Episcopos & præpositos, Dominus elegit; Diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in cœlos Apostoli sibi constituerunt, Episcopatus sui & Ecclesiæ ministros*: Thus he, in his finding the Apostleship called also a Bishoprick. *Act.* 1. 20.—See *Ep.* 42. To *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*.—*Hoc enim vel maxime, frater, & laboramus & laborare debemus, ut unitatem* à Domino & per Apostolos nobis successoribus traditam, *quantum possumus, obtinere curemus*; [i. e. unitatem inter Ecclesiarum Episcopos]. — Again *Ep.* 69. To *Pupianus* slighting and defaming him.—*Hæc dolens profero, cùm te Judicem Dei constituas & Christi, qui dicit ad Apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes Præpositos*, qui Apostolis vicariâ ordinatione succedunt: *Qui audit vos, me audit*, &c. *Inde enim Schismata oriuntur, dum Episcopus, qui unus est, & Ecclesiæ præest, contemnitur.*—— So (Ep. 10, 11, 12.), he blameth some of his Presbyters for reconciling, and communicating, some *lapsi* without his authority;—*Quod nunquam omninò sub antecessoribus factum est: Nec Evangelii nec loci sui memores* (Ep. 10.): *nec Episcopo honorem Sacerdotii sui & Cathedræ reservantes* (Ep. 12.) And *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, *Cyprian's* contemporary, speaketh ironically of *Novatianus*, who would needs be Bishop, there too, at the same time.—Vindex *ille* Evangelii *unum esse debere in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ Episcopum ignoravit*, Cornelius, I suppose, alluding to *Mat.* 16, 18. *Tu es Petrus*; however; one Bishop in one City is, in *Cornelius's* opinion, an *Evangelical* constitution. Cap. *Euseb.* l. 6. c. 42.

See *Athanasius's* Ep. to *Dracontius*, elected to a Bishoprick, and refusing it. —*Quod si nullam omninò mercedem Episcopi functioni destinatam arbitraris*; Servatoremque, qui eam [*Episcopi functionem*] *ita* instituit, *contemnis*; *oro te, ne istiusmodi quid in mentem admittas*, &c. *Nam quæ* Dominus per Apostolos instituit, *ea & bona sunt, & firma persistunt*, &c. Here the Father declares Episcopacy, as it was in his days, to be Christs institution by his Apostles. §. 54.

See

§. 55. See S. *Chryſoſtome* ſufficiently expreſſing his opinion of Biſhops (as ſuperior and contradiſtinct to Presbyters) their being of an Apoſtolical inſtitution, in his Homilies on *Timothy* and *Titus*. See *Hom.* 2. in *Tit.* c. 1. v. 5. *Ut conſtitueres per civitates Presbyteros.* Epiſcopos hîc intelligi *vult, quemadmodum aliàs ſæpè diximus.* [Epiſcopos; ſuch as in his own time; ſuperior to Presbyters.]. See *Serm.* 1. in *Phil.* c. 1. v. 1. Co Epiſcopis & Diaconis. *Quid hoc? An unius civitatis multi erant Epiſcopi? nequaquam. Sed Presbyteros eo nomine appellavit.* —— *Hom.* 13. in 1 *Tim.* 4, 14. —— *Cum impoſitione manuum Presbyterii. Non de Presbyteris ille loquitur, ſed de Epiſcopis. Neque enim Presbyteri Epiſcopum* [Timotheum] *ordinabant.* Firſt, Biſhops, therefore, the Father held to be, in thoſe times; 2ly. *Timothy* to be ſuch; 3ly. But one of them to be in one City; 4ly. To be ſuperior to Presbyters, and ſuch, as they could not ordain. And ſee his *Hom.* on S. *Ignatius*, Tom. 5. where he maketh him Succeſſor in *Antioch* to S. *Peter*; ordained by the Apoſtles, *ut tanto principatu dignus:* For, *quantæ virtutis ac ſapientiæ* (ſaith he) *debet exiſtimari tam celebrem urbem adminiſtrare, & eum populum regere, qui ducenta contineat hominum millia.* Now, what authority *Ignatius* had at *Antioch*, other Biſhops had elſewhere.

§. 56. See *Damaſus*, Ep. 4. *de Chorepiſcopis.* —— *Nullus ex* 70. *Diſcipulis, quorum ſpeciem iſti* [i. e. *Chorepiſcopi & Presbyteri*] *gerunt, nil de hoc, quod* Apoſtolis eorumque ſucceſſoribus [i. e. *Epiſcopis*] *ſpecialiter debebatur, legitur aſſumpſiſſe.*

§. 57. See S. *Ambroſe, de Dignit. Sacerdot.* Cap. 1. —— *Claves illas regni cœlorum in* B. *Petro cuncti ſuſcepimus Sacerdotes* [i. e. *Epiſcopi*, as appears in the following diſcourſe, ſee *c.* 2 3. They, in S. *Peter*, received the keys from *Chriſt*, the Presbyters from them]. —— And ſee the Author bearing the name of S. *Ambroſe* in *Comment. in* 1 *Cor.* c. 12. 28. upon [Quoſdam poſuit Deus Apoſtolos] *Ipſi ſunt Epiſcopi, firmante illud* Petro *Apoſtolo,*

[Act.

[Act. 1.] : *& Epiſcopatum ejus accipiet alter.* ——Again, upon [ſecundò Prophetas]. ——*Et, quia ab uno Deo Patre ſunt omnia, ſingulos Epiſcopos ſingulis Eccleſiis præeſſe decrevit.* [*Singulos ſingulis:* For, though it cannot ‘ be denied, but that, ſometimes, there happened to be ‘ two Biſhops, reſident at the ſame time, in the ſame Ci- ‘ ty, or Dioceſs: Yet were theſe, either Biſhops, * of ‘ ſeveral Nations; as ſome ſay that, in the firſt times, in ‘ ſome greater Cities, there was one Biſhop conſtituted ‘ over the Jews, and another over the Gentiles: Or, ‘ * of ſeveral, and divided profeſſions: As, one of the ‘ *Catholicks*: and another of ſome ſeparated *Sect*: As, ‘ there was another of the *Donatiſts*, in *Africk*, in S. ‘ *Auſtin's* days: another of the *Novatians* in *Italy*, and ‘ elſewhere, in *Cornelius*, and *Cyprian's* days: another of ‘ the *Meletians* in *Egypt*, in *Alexander*, and *Athanaſius*, his ‘ days. But, meanwhile, ſo farr did all Chriſtianity ac- ‘ cord in the preſidency of one Biſhop over one *Paræcia* ‘ or Dioceſs, that the ſame perſons never Ordained, ſet ‘ up, or acknowledged, two at a time, both rightly their ‘ Biſhops.]‘ Again, *ver.* 29. upon [Nunquid omnes Apoſtoli?] *verum eſt* (ſaith he). *Quia in Eccleſiâ unus Epiſcopus eſt.* ——And commenting on *Eph.* 4. 11. [*Et ipſe dedit quoſdam Apoſtolos, quoſdam autem Prophetas, alios verò Evangeliſtas*] He ſaith much the ſame things. —— *Apoſtoli Epiſcopi ſunt, Prophetæ verò explanatores Scripturarum.* —— *Evangeliſtæ Diaconi ſunt.* ——*Inter illos poſt Epiſcopum plus* [*major*] *eſſe intelligitur, qui propter reſeratum occultum Scripturarum ſenſum prophetare dicitur,* ——*qui Ordo nunc poteſt eſſe Presbyterii. Nam in Epiſcopo omnes Ordines ſunt, quia primus Sacerdos eſt, Princeps Sacerdotum* [*Apoſtolus*], *& Propheta, & Evangeliſta,* &c. The ſame Author, rather than to allow the Title of Biſhop, in the Scriptures, to be given to ſingle Presbyters, applies the words *cum Epiſcopis & Diaconibus, Phil.* 1. 1. not to the *Philippians*, but to S. *Paul*; as if it run thus; *Paul*, with the Biſhops and Deacons that are with Him, to the Saints at *Philippi*. For otherwiſe, ſaith he. —— *Loci ipſius*

ſius Epiſcopo ſcribendum erat, non duobus, aut tribus; *ſicut &* [ſcripſit] *ad Titum &* Timotheum, agreeable to his former obſervation. —— *Quia in Eccleſiâ* [i.e. *unâ*] *unus Epiſcopus.* —— The ſame, in his Comment in 1 *Tim.* 3. —— *Omnis Epiſcopus Presbyter, non tamen omnis Presbyter Epiſcopus.* —— Timotheus *Epiſcopus erat. Unde & quemadmodum Epiſcopum ordinet, oſtendit.* —— *Neque enim fas erat, ut inferior* [i. e. *quivis Presbyter*] *ordinaret majorem* [i. e. *Epiſcopum*, or *primum Presbyterorum*]; *Nemo enim tribuit, quod non accepit.* [Where know, that this Author takes the *Epiſcopus* deſcribed in 1 *Tim.* 3. as S. *Chryſoſtome* and other Fathers do, in the modern notion thereof, as he is ſuperior to Presbyters; as appears through the context, defining him to be *Epiſcopus, qui inter Presbyteros primus eſt*, —— and ſaying before, that —— *cæteris melior debet eſſe, qui cupidus eſt ſedis illius* —— *& licita debet ſpernere propter ſublimitatem ipſius Ordinis.* Only he, (putting, then, the ſame, with the modern, Epiſcopal dignity), ſaith, that at the firſt, Presbyters were promoted to this dignity, not by merit, but ſeniority. Of which ſee more below §. 76. 79. Meanwhile, ſuch Biſhops, (for authority), this Authour conceived to be in *Timothie*'s time, as in his own.

§. 58. See S. *Epiphanius* to the ſame purpoſe. —— *Docet divinus Apoſtoli ſermo, quis ſit Epiſcopus, & quis Presbyter*; *cùm* *Hær.* 75. *dicit ad* Timotheum, qui erat Epiſcopus; *Presbyterum ne objurges*, &c.

§. 59. See S. *Aug.* in *Pſal.* 45, 16. —— *Quid eſt*, pro patribus tuis nati ſunt tibi filii? *miſſi ſunt Apoſtoli, Patres: pro Apoſtolis filii nati ſunt tibi, conſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi. Hodiè enim Epiſcopi, qui ſunt per totum mundum, unde nati ſunt? Ipſa Eccleſia Patres illos appellat, ipſa illos genuit, & ipſa illos conſtituit in ſedibus Patrum* [i.e. *Apoſtolorum*]. —— And Ep. 42. *ad Madaurenſ.* —— *Videtis multos præciſos à radice Chriſtianæ ſocietatis, quæ per ſedes Apoſtolorum, & ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum, certâ per orbem propagatione diffunditur, de ſolâ figurâ Originis, ſub Chriſtiano nomine quaſi areſcentia ſarmenta, gloriari*; *quas Hæreſes & ſchiſmata nominamus.* [*Præciſi* then *à ſucceſſione*

ceſſione Epiſcoporum are *Hæretici & ſchiſmatici* in this Father's Judgment.]—And, *de Verbis Dom. Ser.* 24. *Si ſolis Epiſcopis dixit; Qui vos, me ſpernit, ſpernite nos* [Epiſcopos]. *Si autem ſermo ejus pervenit ad nos, & vocavit nos, &* in eorum loco *conſtituit* nos, *videte, ne ſpernatis nos.* See him *cont. lit. Petil.* l. 2. c. 51. which *Petilianus* called the *Cathedram Apoſtolicam* (urged againſt them by Catholicks) *Cathedram peſtilentiæ.* Where ſaith the Father; *Cathedra tibi quid fecit* * *Eccleſiæ Romanæ, in quâ* Petrus *ſedit, & in quâ hodie* Anaſtaſius *ſedet: vel* * *Eccleſiæ* Hieroſolymitanæ, *in quâ* Jacobus *ſedit, & in quâ hodie* Johannes *ſedet?* —And, *Contra Creſcon.* l. 2. c. 37. *Eccleſiam Hieroſolymitanam primus Apoſtolus* Jacobus *Epiſcopatu ſuo rexit.* [*Biſhop John* then ſucceeding, there, in the like authority to *Biſhop James.*]. So, *Epiſtle* 162. commenting on *Rev.* 2. 2, 3. He ſaith—*Divinâ voce laudatur ſub Angeli nomine Præpoſitus Eccleſiæ.*— And his calling the *Biſhoprick* of *Rome, ſedes & Cathedra Apoſtolica* (as he doth often; ſee *Epiſtle* 162.—*In Romanâ Eccleſiâ ſemper Apoſtolicæ Cathedræ viguit principatus—&* Ep. 92. *ad* Innocentium;—*Quia te Dominus gratiæ ſuæ præcipuo munere, in ſede Apoſtolicâ collocavit*) argues, that he held him, who poſſeſſed that *Cathedra* in his time, to have it from the Apoſtles (and then ſo will the other Epiſcopal *Cathedræ* too). But, ſuppoſing that the Church had ſet up that *Cathedra*, or had ſet up all that power, which *Innocent* then had, after the Apoſtle's times, it ought to have been called, *Cathedra Eccleſiaſtica*, and not *Apoſtolica.*

Laſtly, ſee S. *Hierome* as full as any in this matter. Review the place quoted before §. 42. n. 2.—*Jacobus ab Apoſtolis*, &c.—See Ep. *ad Evagrium*—*Ut ſciamus traditiones Apoſtolicas ſumptas de Veteri Teſtamento; Quod* Aaron *& filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc ſibi Epiſcopi, & Presbyteri, & Diaconi in Eccleſiâ vendicent.*—And, Ep. *ad Nepotianum.*—*Quod* Aaron *& filii ejus, hoc Epiſcopum & Presbyteros eſſe noverimus.* —And, in Ep. 54. ſpeaking of the Biſhops of his own time, he ſaith; —*Apud nos Apoſtolorum locum tenent* §. 60.

Epiſcopi.—And, in *Pſ.* 45. 16.—*Nunc, quia Apoſtoli à mundo receſſerunt, habes pro his Epiſcopos filios: ſunt & hi Patres tui, quia ab ipſis regeris.* And, Ep. 1. *ad* Heliodor. ſpeaking of the modern Biſhops, he ſaith.—*Stant loco* Pauli, *tenent locum* Petri; calling there alſo the Deaconſhip, *tertius gradus.*—And, Dial. *adverſus* Luciferian.—*Si quæris, quare in Eccleſiâ baptizatus, niſi per manus Epiſcopi* [and not, *Presbyteri*], *non accipiat Spiritum Sanctum, diſce hanc obſervationem ex eâ authoritate deſcendere, quòd Spiritus Sanctus ad Apoſtolos deſcendit.*—And, Ep. *ad* Riparium *adverſus* Vigilant.—*Miror Sanctum Epiſcopum, in cujus paræchiâ eſſe Presbyter dicitur, acquieſcere furori ejus, & non virgâ Apoſtolicâ confringere vas inutile, & tradere in interitum carnis*, &c. The Biſhop therefore, *virgâ Apoſtolicâ*, ruleth over Presbyters,—and ſee what is more deduced from this Father, below §. 76. n. 2. To theſe may be added thoſe Teſtimonies of this, or other, Fathers (ſee S. *Jerom*'s two Epiſtles to *Damaſus*) where they call the Chair of the Biſhop of *Rome*, *Cathedra Petri*, or *ſedes Apoſtolica.* Now; if the Fathers aſſerted the Biſhops of their own days, to have derived their authority from the Apoſtles, it will follow, that whatſoever authority theſe later Biſhops had from the Apoſtles, (in the opinion of theſe Fathers) the ſame alſo had the firſt: and, 2ly. it will follow, that if ſo be, that theſe Biſhops were ſucceſſors to the Apoſtles in that, in which the Apoſtles were Succeſſors to Chriſt, then, if the Apoſtles were *jure divino*, ſo are the Biſhops.

§. 61. n. 1.

Likewiſe there are many expreſſions in the Fathers, which argue, that not only Biſhops above Presbyters, but *Metropolitans* alſo above Biſhops, were either in the Apoſtle's times, or in the next ages to them. See *Euſeb.* l. 6. c. 1.—Where it is ſaid; *Demetrium* [A. D. 190.] paroeciarum *Alexandriæ, ac reliquæ* Ægypti, Epiſcopatum *poſt* Julianum *ſuſcepiſſe*: Now every *Paroecia*, then, was a ſeveral Dioceſs or Biſhoprick. 'For the whole extent of a Biſhop's See, (and not thoſe leſſer Churches or 'Congregations of Chriſtians in the Country Villages, that

That there were alſo *Metropolitans* ſuperior to other Biſhops either in, or ſoon after, the Apoſtle's times, teſtified, by the Fathers.

that belonged to one Biſhoprick, and were committed ‘ to the *Chorepiſcopi*, or the *Presbyteri Regionarii*) was ‘ only, in thoſe Ancienter times, or at leaſt in this Au- ‘ thor, called *Paroecia*: The great and prime Biſhops, ‘ within their ſeveral Provinces or Dioceſſes (a term bor- ‘ rowed from the Civil Prefectures and Governments), ‘ in ſome Cities of higher note, as Chriſtians increaſed, ‘ erecting new Epiſcopacies; delegating to other country ‘ Villages, not ſo conſiderable, *Chorepiſcopi* or Presby- ‘ ters. But afterward ſo it was, that every Biſhop's ‘ See was called a Dioceſs (ſee 4. *Conc. Carthag.* c. 36.); ‘ and the place of the Country Presbyter's reſidence, a ‘ pariſh (ſee *Innocent. ad Decent*: c. 5.); as Chriſtianity ‘ grew more extended, for number; ſo *Dioceſes*, and *Pa-* ‘ *roecia* having their ſignification contracted, for place.] ‘

So, in *Euſeb.* l. 1. c. 21. *Irenaeus* Biſhop of *Lions* is ſaid *moderari* Paroecias *per* Galliam. *Polycrates* Biſhop of *Epheſus* ſaid *praeſſe Epiſcopis per* Aſiam. *Narciſſus* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, and *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Caſarea*, praeſſe Epiſcopis *per* Palaeſtinam, *&c.*: and the ſame may be ſaid of their contemporary, *Victor*, then Biſhop of *Rome*. —— See S. *Ignatius* inſcribing his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων: *Eccleſiae, quae* praeſidet, *&c.* in which Epiſtle he ſtileth himſelf Biſhop of the Church in *Syria*; which muſt needs have more *Paroecias*, or Epiſcopal ſeats in it, than only that of *Antioch*. So, the ſeven Cities of *Aſia*, to whom our Saviour's Epiſtle is directed, are found to be, in thoſe days, all or moſt of them, *Metropoles* in the Civil notion, and are conceived alſo to be ſo in the Eccleſiaſtical. For S. *Ignatius* writeth to two other Churches contained in this *Proconſular* Aſia, *Trallis & Magneſia*, naming alſo their Biſhops, which probably would not have been omitted by our Saviour, had they not been ſubordinate Churches. Laſtly, the Preface to the ſixth *Nicene* Canon: τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἤθη κρατείτω *antiquus mos perduret*, in their declaring the ſuperiority of *Metropolitans*: And, long before this again, S. *Cypri-*

See Biſhop *Usher*, Orig. of *Metrop.* p. 67.

an's

an's jampridem. —— *Jampridem per omnes* provincias *& per urbes singulas ordinati sunt Episcopi.* (Ep. 52. *ad* Antonianum against *Novatian*'s innovations), [*per* omnes provincias *Episcopi*, i.e. the *Metropolitans*, per urbes singulas, the *Diocesans.*] I say, these; *antiquus mos*, in the Council of *Nice*; and this *jampridem* in S. *Cyprian*, so long before *Nice*, advance *Metropolitans*, if not to, near to, the Apostles times, and several Fathers ‖ think both *Ephesus* in *Asia*, and *Gortyna* in *Creet* to have been, *Metropoles* in *Timothies* and *Titus* his times: and these two to have been, at least for some part of their time, Archbishops or *Metropolitans*; the one of *Creet*, the other of the Proconsular *Asia.*

‖ See them in Dr. *Hammond* Schism c. 3. Sect. 11, &c. Bishop *Usher* Orig. of *Metrop.* p. 72.

Sect 61. *n.* 2. After such evidences in Antiquity for the clearing of this proposition, [that single persons in all places, whereof any Records are left us, succeeded the Apostles in an authority superior to the rest of the Presbyters]; yet several things are still alledged to enervate and render them useless, as to the firm establishing of any such perpetual Government in the Church.

1. 1. First, such evidence is pleaded to be defective, because of a general silence in Antiquity, concerning such successors, as to the Churches planted by many of the Apostles. For thus argues a late Writer: *that if but one place vary* [from the rest] *it is enough to overthrow the necessity of any one form of Government* [from Apostolical practice:] and then: *that, the Records of antiquity not giving us an account, what was done by the Apostles in the several* [which in his arguing must mean *all*] *Churches planted by them, hence it is not possible, we should attain any certainty of what the Apostle's* [Universal] *practice was.* And after this he urgeth this passage of *Eusebius* Hist. l. 3. c. 4. Ὅσοι δὲ τότων, καί τινες, &c. —— *Quot*, or *quàm multi verò & quinam ex illis* [Apostolorum discipulis] *sinceri imitatores facti, Ecclesias ab illis fundatas pascere idonei æstimati sunt, non poterit facile dici, nisi quot aliquis fortè ex* Pauli *verbis collegerit. A place* (saith he) *enough of it self to blast the whole credit of antiqui-*

Mr. *Stillingfl. Irenicum.* p. 295.

Id. p. 297.

ty,

ty, as to the matter now in debate [i. e. what perſons ſucceeded the Apoſtles]. 2ly. Suppoſing this ſucceſſion every where (not omitting one place), could be ſhewed, as compleat as is required, yet then again, it is further, exacted that it alſo be manifeſted, whether the Apoſtles, and afterwards thoſe who ſucceeded them, *viz. Timothy*, or *Titus* did depute ſuch ſingle perſons in their places, *with an opinion of the neceſſity of doing it*; for this alſo is ſaid. *What they* [Timothy or Titus] *did, is not the whole queſtion, but what they did with an opinion of the neceſſity of doing it? whether they were bound to do it, or no?* So that, unleſs this alſo can be ſhewed: that thoſe, who ſubſtituted ſingle perſons for their ſucceſſors, thought alſo themſelves bound to do it, this, whether a ſingle perſon or a Presbytery ought to govern the Churches, will remain ſtill a *Quodlibet*. —— Again 3ly. Such an Apoſtolical practice being granted general; yet a liberty ſtill is challenged of non-conforming to it, from a pretence of other Apoſtolical practices, or alſo precepts afterward lawfully laid aſide. For this alſo is urged. Firſt, *that certain offices appointed by the Apoſtle, yet are ceaſed:* Widows, Diaconeſſes. 2ly. *That ſeveral Rites and Cuſtoms Apoſtolical are grown out of uſe.* 1. *Such as were founded upon Apoſtolical precept or decree*, Act. 15. 29. Abſtaining from Blood and things ſtrangled, and offered to Idols. 2. *Such as were grounded in their practice*; Holy kiſs, Love-feaſts, dipping in Baptiſm, Community of goods, &c, *and thence it is concluded. That before an acknowledged Apoſtolical practice may be looked on as obligatory, it muſt be made appear, that what, they did, was not according as they ſaw reaſon and cauſe for the doing it, depending on ſeveral circumſtances of time, place, and perſons* [and ſo this afterward diſpenſable]; *but, that they did it from ſome unalterable law of Chriſt, or from ſome ſuch reaſons undiſpenſable, as moſt equally hold in all times, places, and perſons.* 4. In the laſt place ſeveral inſtances are produced to ſhew; *that the Records of Antiquity do contain much ambiguity, repugnancy, and partiality, in their teſtimonies concerning this matter.*

2. —— *Id. p.* 187.

3. —— *Id. p.* 230. 344.

4. —— *Id. p.* 299.

To

Sect. 61. n. 3. To theſe things I have this to ſay, that you may receive no prejudice by them againſt Antiquity, and the former quotations.

To 1. To the firſt evaſion, this I yield; that, could an evidence be produced out of Antiquity of the ſucceſſion of ſingle perſons for all places ſave one, yet can we have no abſolute infallible certainty but that in that one place a Presbytery might be eſtabliſhed: and I add; that, were the records for ſingle perſons abſolutely univerſal, neither could we yet attain ſuch an infallible certainty, ſince ſome one record or other might poſſibly be falſified. But, this not hindring, I affirm: that, ſince (as partly appears, above) all thoſe records of Churches, that are extant, though many of theſe Churches at a great diſtance, and having ſeveral Founders, do declare a ſucceſſion of ſingle perſons; and 2ly. Since, the Records of ſeveral of the chief Churches are extant, to which we may preſume the Government of inferior Churches conformable; and, 3ly. Since of many other Churches, wherein we have no records of the Apoſtle's firſt Succeſſors, yet we have of the next perſons ſucceeding thoſe firſt, which we find to accord with the reſt, I affirm; that theſe are ſufficient grounds to ſway and ſatisfie a rational man of the general uniformity of ſuch a practice: and that he (only) is unreaſonable, who, in matters of ſuch a nature, exacts infallible certainty. And further I add; that, if in theſe Records ſome one ſhould vary from the reſt, it ought rather to be preſumed, that there was ſome ſwerving from the Apoſtolick orders therein, than that ſuch an uniformity, as is found in the reſt, deputing every where ſingle perſons, ſhould proceed from a caſual indifferency. As for Univerſality of Records, though thoſe in the times immediately following the Apoſtles, when, the Church being little, and its perſecutions great, few writ, do not ariſe to ſuch a plenitude, as ſome expect: Yet if we find later Records mentioning ſuch ſingle perſons governing moſt Churches in the ſecond and third age, *i. e.* in the very next times to the firſt (which hath been ſhew'd before) here

here is *ſufficient* aſſurance, that in the firſt were the like. For none can, rationally, imagine ſo univerſal and conſonant alteration of Government, in places ſo remote from one another, and this ſwerving from that which was introduced by the Founders of Chriſtianity, in ſo ſmall a time, in ſo religious and united a Corporation as Chriſtians then were; ſo that, if we knew not the model of any immediate Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, yet knowing the model of the next to them, we have in theſe latter a Copy of the firſt. To the quotation out of *Euſebius*; the words next following are theſe. —— *Hujus enim innumeri co-operarii, & commilitones fuerunt*, and of theſe he ſaith: It is not eaſie to tell, ὅσοι καὶ τινες How many, or which [*i. e.* all which] were made Paſtors of Churches or Biſhops, except thoſe mentioned by the Apoſtle. He doth not mean: not eaſie to tell, whether any at all were ſo; but not eaſie to tell, all that were ſo. For this Hiſtorian in the very ſame Chapter nameth ſeveral, *Linus*, *Clemens*, *Dionyſius Areopagita* to have been made Biſhops, who are not mentioned to be ſo by S. *Paul*, but collected by *Euſebius* to have been ſo, out of other Authors, (ſee ſeveral of them quoted above §. 42.) whoſe teſtimony is clear enough, and whom He, and afterward S. *Jerom* in his Catalogue, and all poſterity ſince hath hitherto eſteemed moſt Reverend and authentick, and it is now too late to go about to aſperſe them; ſome of which Authors writing within a Century, others within half a Century, of the Apoſtle's times, for ſo ſhort a ſpace as intervenes we have no reaſon to diſtruſt the fidelity of an Oral Tradition, ſuppoſing that theſe peruſed not alſo other writings now periſhed.

To the ſecond evaſion I ſay. Firſt, That this is the deſtructive way that Hereticks have trod. Such plea the *Socinians* uſed: * againſt the neceſſity of a perpetual obſervance of Baptiſme. *Omnes, qui ad Eccleſiam ſeſe conferunt, baptiſmi religione devinctos eſſe*, nequaquam demonſtrari poſſe. —— and —— *Omnia quæ ibi* [Mark 16. 16.] Sect. 61. n. 4.

To 2. —— 1.

Volkel. l.6.c. 14. 16.] *dicuntur ad omnia prorsus ſæcula non trahenda, niſi — aperta ſacrarum literarum teſtimonia doceant ea perpetuò durare debere.* — & *falſum eſt, Apoſtolos ita hunc ritum in Eccleſiam induxiſſe, ut omnes perpetuò devinciret,* &c. — * Againſt the neceſſity of the Prieſt's conſecrating or *Id.* l.4.c.22. diſpenſing of the Euchariſt. — *Rem ſanè adiaphoram eſſe, cùm a Chriſto nobis imperata non ſit,* &c. —* Againſt the neceſſity or perpetuity of a ſucceſſive ordination, or per- *Id.* l.6. c.11. ſonal ſucceſſion of Clergy. — *Quod ſi ſucceſſio — ad Paſtorem Eccleſiæ conſtituendum requiritur, qui fit, ut in muneris iſtius deſcriptione, quæ ſat fusè apud* Paulum *ducibus in locis explicata eſt, nullum de eâ præceptum, nullam literam extare videamus?* * Againſt any perpetual and *Id.* l.6.c.4.— & l.5.c.15. ſucceſſive power of the Keys. — *Claves iſtas Apoſtolorum proprias fuiſſe,* — *& non neceſſe eſſe eam poteſtatem in certis perſonis, quæ ligent, ſolvantque, etiamnum reſidere,* — *cùm nec verbis Chriſti hæc ſententia contineatur, nec ipſa rei iſtius ratio nos ita ſtatuere permittat.* Thus they; ſeeking to overthrow the Church's conſtant Traditions with their negative arguments from Scripture. Here I recommend to your reading what Right of Church *l.*3.*p.* 152. &c. Mr. *Thorndike* hath judiciouſly written on this matter. *As concerning the objection* (ſaith he) * *that there is no precept in the Scripture, that Biſhops govern all Churches*; *and* * *that many things ordained by the Apoſtles are aboliſhed in the Church*; *it is a queſtion, whether it comes from leſs skill, or proceeds to worſe conſequence. For, unleſs we will betray the advantages of the Church to very many and perhaps to all Hereſies and Schiſms that ever were, we muſt confeſs, that, as there are precepts in the Scripture that oblige not*; *ſo there are many things, not ſet down in the Scripture in the form of precepts, that oblige, and theſe are to be diſcern'd* (he ſaith afterward) *by the Church's uninterrupted practice of them:* Thus devolving the matter upon the Church's authority and judgment. 2ly. This queſtion concerning the A- 2. poſtle's or their ſucceſſor's, *neceſſarily*, appointing other ſingle perſons in their places, ſeems needleſly raiſed;

raiſed; 1. So long as the well being of the Church under ſuch Government for ſo many Ages ſhews, that there is no neceſſity of altering it. 2. So long as the Governours, left by the Apoſtles actually in poſſeſſion of this Government, think not fit to change it: Becauſe none ſave they that receive ſuch power (ſuppoſe the power of Ordaining Presbyters) can give it: Nor none can lawfully execute ſuch power, till firſt given them. The Apoſtles therefore leaving this power of Ordaining in the hands of ſome ſingle perſons, others, (ſuppoſe Presbyteries) can never become poſſeſſed of it, till theſe ſingle perſons are firſt pleaſed to alienate it: unleſs we be of their perſwaſion, who hold in the New Teſtament no Conſecration or Ordination needful by Scripture for ſuch Offices, but only the ſecular Power's appointment and Election. ——3ly. 'Tis no way probable, that a thing thought meerly indifferent and of no neceſſity to be done, ſhould continue, ſo long, ſo Univerſally to be done. Neither may we ſafely forbear doing, what was thus done by the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors, *till it ſhall be proved to us, that, they held alſo ſome neceſſity of doing it; * but only then, when it ſhall be proved to us, that they held no neceſſity of doing it. But for the neceſſity of the Apoſtle's Succeſſors committing the Church Government into other hands ſo, as the Apoſtles did into theirs, there wants not a ſufficient ground. For, to omit thoſe places wherein the Apoſtle in general frequently propoſeth his own example for imitation, Even that charge to *Timothy* (2 *Tim.* 2. 2.), ſeems, *à pari*, to extend to the Apoſtolical Inſtitutions, (eſpecially this main one concerning Government on which the ſtability of the Church's Doctrines ſo much depends, ſee *Eph.* 4. 11, 13.), as well as Doctrines; which we ſhall not difficultly aſſent to, if we remember, that, though not here, yet elſewhere, the ſame Apoſtle gives the ſame charge concerning his Traditions. 2 *Theſ.* 2. 15. —— *Therefore Brethren ſtand faſt and hold the Traditions,* 3.

which ye have been taught by Word, or Epiſtle—— [which obſervance of Traditions belongs no more to the *Theſſalonians* than *Epheſians*, nor to the Governours of the one place, than of the other]:——and, 1 *Cor.* 11. 2. he praiſeth them for *keeping his Traditions*, as well as precepts: and ver. 16. Urgeth, againſt their Women being uncovered in the Church, the contrary *cuſtom of the Churches*: ſurely, as having ſome obligation in it, eſpecially when Univerſal: Of which cuſtoms alſo we find him much to affect an uniformity; as you may ſee by comparing this place with 1 *Cor.* 4. 17. —and 7. 17. Which Uniformity muſt, rationally, be interpreted, as of one place, ſo of one time alſo, to another. Elſe his death would quit the Church from further obſervance of his Traditions, unleſs ſuch, as he ſhould expreſly nominate for Univerſal and perpetual, whereas (on the contrary) all delivered are to be taken as perpetual, unleſs ſome particular circumſtances (of which the Church is to judge) ſhall evidence them for local or temporary. Thus, there is held (ſtill) a neceſſity of *Ordination* of the ſacred Church-Miniſtery: though an expreſs order, for the perpetuity of it, can no more be ſhew'd in the Decretal Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, than it is ſaid, that there cannot be ſhewed for the perſons who are perpetually to conferr ſuch Ordination. —— And thus, *Calvin* concludes, Impoſition of hands ſtill to be retained in Ordination, though without a precept (*Inſtit.* l. 4. c. 3. Sect. 16.) ——*Licet nullum* (ſaith he) *extet certum præceptum de manuum impoſitione, quia tamen fuiſſe in perpetuo uſu Apoſtolis videmus, illa accurata eorum obſervatio præcepti vice nobis eſſe debet.* As ſome others therefore urge, that, if the Apoſtle had intended to eſtabliſh any one form of Church-Government, he would have given expreſs charge concerning it in thoſe Epiſtles, ſo may I inferr, that, if the Apoſtle intended to leave the form of Government indifferent, he would not thus have determined it in his practice, in committing it to ſingle perſons, and not to a Presbytery, after

after he had given ſo frequent directions to obſerve his Traditions and keep the Ordinances, as he delivered them, and to follow his example. For he might preſume, that ſuch his pattern would become, to poſterity, a Rule; as indeed it did; eſpecially being corroborated with the ſame pattern from S. *Peter* alſo, and *John*, and the other Apoſtles, as you have ſeen above in all thoſe Catalogues (which have come to our hands) of ſingle perſons (not Presbyteries) their Succeſſors in the Churches, which they founded. This to the ſecond evaſion.

As to the third, *viz.* the inſtances in ſeveral Apoſtolical inſtitutions, or practices, afterward changed or laid aſide, which may ſeem to overthrow what we have here replyed to the ſecond: Firſt I deſire you to reflect, that, if an expreſs Apoſtolical precept, or command (which they often call for) could be ſhewed for Epiſcopal government, yet neither can this, (unleſs the Word [*perpetual*] be inſerted) ſatisfie them, becauſe here are produced not only Apoſtolical practices, but precepts (as *Act.* 15. 29.) temporary. 2ly. I therefore willingly yield, that ſome Apoſtolical practices, or alſo Injunctions and Conſtitutions, and thoſe of Offices too, if you will, are alterable, and this for the cauſe alſo there alledged; *viz.* becauſe ſuch are preſcribed, or introduced, by the Apoſtles, upon reaſons and conſiderations not holding equally for all places, times, and perſons: but, if ſome (thus) alterable, yet it follows not, that therefore any, or all, are ſo. And to this alſo I ſuppoſe they will aſſent. The Queſtion then you ſee will be, who ſhall judge, what practices are alterable, what not? or, when the reaſons of them are diſpenſable, when indiſpenſable? And here, if any private man, or any leſſer part of a ſociety (which is all one), may judge of theſe practices and reaſons, when diſpenſable; we cannot but ſee, what confuſion will enſue; every one eſtabliſhing or abrogating what he pleaſeth. But, if we will have thoſe,

§. 61. n. 5.

To 3.

1.

2.

thoſe, to whom our Saviour hath committed his authority, to judge ſuch matters; then, as to this practice or conſtitution now in queſtion, our controverſy is at an end. For I have ſufficiently ſhewed you in this Diſcourſe, that the ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtracy, Biſhops and Councils, have declared Epiſcopacy as a ſtanding and unalterable Government, eſtabliſhed *jure divino*, or *Apoſtolico*; and accordingly have in all times required obedience unto it, as ſuch: and have and do continue it through ſo many centuries to this day. For, how inconſiderable a party are they, in reſpect of the whole, and hence void of any title to be a Judge, who oppoſe it? But the other forenamed practices, and conſtitutions, the ſame Judges have abrogated, or rather permitted to run into a deſuetude, becauſe deemed by them, * to be founded on temporary reaſons and occaſions, and * of leſs moment alſo to be ſtill retained. —— So the Widdows and Deaconeſſes laid aſide; becauſe founded for certain ſervices and attendances about women in their baptiſm, in their travels, in their Church-aſſemblies, &c, now uſeleſs, becauſe of the modern cuſtomes in theſe things much varied. — So, abſtaining from blood, &c, diſuſed; becauſe founded on giving no offence, when Chriſtianity had ſome growth amongſt the *Jews*, and Idolatry was continued among the *Gentiles*.—So, dipping in Baptiſme laid aſide, becauſe Chriſtianity came to inhabit colder regions, not ſafely admitting it: Holy Kiſſe, and Love-Feaſts at the Euchariſt omitted, when ſo great a world, being now entred into the boſom of the Church, made theſe ſubject to irremediable abuſes. As for community of Goods, preaching without ſtipend, &c, it was only then, as now, voluntary, and done by ſome only; and it is now, as then, obſerved, by thoſe, who ſtrive to arrive at perfection, in ſeveral parts of Chriſtendom. But what reaſons thoſe are, upon which Epiſcopal Government ſhould be founded, that will not equally hold in all times, I ſee not. Nor am I, but the Church, a com-

competent judge in this matter. 4. Laſtly, As for thoſe inſtances, which are brought to make good that *Ambiguity*, *Repugnancy*, and *Partiality*, with which the Ancients, in delivering their teſtimony in this matter, are charged; ſo many, as I thought of moment, are replied-to in the latter part of this diſcourſe. Only let me here obſerve to you concerning ſuch language; that men ſeldom ſpeak ill of their Friends, or debilitate the teſtimony of thoſe, who, they think, favour their cauſe. To 4.

CHAP. IV.

§. 62.

FRom this excurſion, I now proceed to conſider this ſuperior Authority of Biſhops, (eſteemed by the Fathers, as I have ſhewed, to have been derived from the Apoſtle's times) a little more ſtrictly and particularly. 1. Firſt, then, This ſuperior Authority Epiſcopal was anciently ſuch; as that, what ever Eccleſiaſtical Acts or Functions were by the Biſhops committed to the Presbyters in their Ordination, yet [1.] they might exerciſe none of them afterward, without the Biſhop's licence, or commiſſion: Becauſe indeed the Biſhop was the chief Paſtor, and had the chief charge of the whole Church, within the circuit of his Biſhoprick: [2.] Nor ordinarily, however commiſſioned by the Biſhop, did they perform thoſe functions, in the firſt times, when the Biſhop was preſent; but himſelf did them. 2ly. This ſuperior Authority Epiſcopal was ſuch; that ſome other Eccleſiaſtical Acts or Functions the Presbyters might not do at all: except perhaps, ſome of them, in ſome caſe of neceſſity; and that by a ſpecial delegation from the Biſhop. (Of which ſee more below §. 67.).

The ſuperior authority of the ancient Biſhops to Presbyters ſhewed in ſeveral particulars.

For

§. 63. *n.* 1.

1. Presbyters, not to exercise any Ecclesiastical Function without the Bishop's licence.

For the first: that the Presbyters might do nothing without the Bishop's leave, nor did, usually, officiate in his presence, see what is quoted before (§. 44. *n.* 1.) out of S. *Ignatius* ad *Smyrnenses*) and (§. 50.) out of *Tertull. de Baptismo.* And see further *Can. Apost.* 40. —— *Presbyteri & Diaconi, præter Episcopum, nihil agere pertentent. Nam populus Dei ipsi commissus est, & pro animabus eorum Hic redditurus est rationem:* [*rationem reddituri* the Presbyters too in some sense: But he principally]. —— Can. Apost. 32. —— *si quis Presbyter contemnens Episcopum suum, seorsim, congregationem, & altare erexerit, nihil habens, quo reprehendat Episcopum in causâ pietatis & justitiæ, deponatur,* [ὡς φιλαρχῶν] *ut principatus amator. Congregationem & altare erexerit.* i. e. to preach and consecrate the communion there. (See this Canon repeated in *Conc. Antioch.* c. 5. —— and in *Conc. Chalced.* 4. *Act.*) —— Concil. Gangrens. c. 6. *Si quis extra Ecclesiam seorsum conventus celebrat &c, non conveniente Presbytero juxta decretum Episcopi, Anathema sit.* [The like to which see in S. *Cyprian* Ep. 69. *Ad Pupianum* —— *Illi sunt Ecclesia, plebs sacerdoti adunata, & pastori suo grex adhærens. Unde scire debes, Episcopum in Ecclesiâ, & Ecclesiam in Episcopo esse; &, si quis cum Episcopo non sit, in Ecclesiâ non esse: & frustra sibi blandiri eos, qui, pacem cum sacerdotibus Dei non habentes, obrepunt, & latenter apud quosdam communicare se credunt.* And Ep. 55. *ad Cornelium*, against *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus* not obeying him. —— *Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quàm inde, quòd sacerdoti Dei* [*Episcopo*] *non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesiâ ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex vice Christi cogitatur.* A sentence repeated again by him, Ep. 69. against *Pupianus.* But to return to the Canons] —— See *Conc. Arelatense* (before that of *Nice*), c. 19. —— *Conc. Ancyran.* c. 13. *Nec sine Authoritate literarum Episcopi, in unaquâque Parochiâ, aliquid agere.* —— *Conc. Laodicen* (before the *Nicene*), c. 56. —— *Non oportet Presbyteros ante ingressum Episcopi ingredi Ecclesiam, & sedere*

ſedere in Tribunali, ſed eum Epiſcopo ingredi; niſi forte aut ægrotet Epiſcopus, aut eum abeſſe conſtiterit in peregrinationis commodo.—Conſtit. Apoſt. l. 8. c. 34, 35.—*Epiſcopus benedicit, à Presbyteris benedictionem non accipit.*—*Benedicat Epiſcopus Aquam & Oleum, ſi abſit, benedicat Presbyter.*—2. Conc. Carthag. *cap.* 9.—*Numidius Epiſcopus dixit;* —*In quibuſdam locis ſunt Presbyteri, qui aut ignorantes ſimpliciter, aut diſſimulantes audaciter, præſente & inconſulto Epiſcopo complurimis in domiciliis agunt agenda, quod diſciplinæ incongruum cognoſcit eſſe ſanctitas veſtra.*—See *S. Leo*'s Epiſtle *l.* 8. to the Biſhops of *Germany* and *France*, where he telleth them, what it was not lawful for Presbyters (*qui geſtant figuram 70. Diſcipulorum*) to do at all; and what, not lawful to do in the Biſhop's preſence; thus ſpeaking of the latter.—*Sed neque coram Epiſcopo licet Presbyteris in Baptiſterium introire; nec præſente Antiſtite Infantem tingere, aut ſignare; nec pœnitentem, ſine præceptione Epiſcopi ſui, reconciliare; nec, eo præſente, niſi illo jubente, ſacramentum corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti conficere; nec, eo coram poſito, populum docere vel benedicere.* And muchwhat the ſame is ſaid before him by *Damaſus*, Ep. 4. *de Chorepiſcopis*—See S. *Hierom contra Luciferi.*—*Cui* [Epiſcopo] *ſi non exors quædam, & ab omnibus eminens detur poteſtas, tot efficientur ſchiſmata, quot ſunt ſacerdotes: Inde venit, ut ſine Epiſcopi miſſione, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus, jus habeant baptizandi.* See more to this purpoſe diligently collected by Dr. *Taylor* in Epiſcopacy aſſerted §. 37. And here remember, that theſe later Canons are defended and countenanced by the like teſtimonies of the antienter Writers, *Ignatius*, and *Tertullian*, and one age found conveying the ſame things to another, that you may not ſay, they are only new orders of later times.

We find alſo in *Poſſidius*, that it continued a Cuſtom in *Africk*, till S. *Auſtin*'s days, that no Presbyter did preach in the preſence of the Biſhop, though in the Oriental Churches it had, of a long time, been practiſed §. 63. *n.* 2. *Vita Auguſtini.*

ſed otherwiſe.—*Eidem Presbytero* [Auguſtino] *poteſtatem dedit* [Valerius *Epiſcopus Latinâ linguâ minus inſtructus*] *coram ſe in Eccleſiâ Evangelium prædicandi; contra uſum quidem, & conſuetudinem Africanarum Eccleſiarum: unde etiam ei nonnulli Epiſcopi detrahebant. Sed ille, in Orientalibus Eccleſiis id ex more fieri ſciens, utilitati Eccleſiæ conſulens obtrectatorum non curabat linguas.* Thus *Poſſidius*. As for S. *Hierom*'s cenſure of this Cuſtom, *in Ep. ad Nepot.*—*Peſſima conſuetudinis eſt in quibuſdam Eccleſiis, tacere Presbyteros, & præſentibus Epiſcopis non loqui.* He denieth not the Biſhop's licence neceſſary; but finds fault, that ſuch licence is not given to Presbyters to ſpeak, when either the Biſhops themſelves do it not, or do it weakly.

§.63.n.3.

'[Again 'tis worth your marking, (that you 'may ſee, that the Biſhop was, as the chiefeſt, ſo the 'moſt common, Actor of all Sacerdotal functions in 'his *Paræcia*), that, in a *Paræcia* (ſince called Dio'ceſs) or the whole extent of a Biſhoprick, when Chri'ſtians were as yet not ſo numerous, there ſeemeth to 'have been ſometimes but one Church or place of pub'lick aſſembly for the ſolemn ſervice; and but one Al'tar. See *Mede* of Churches. *p.* 29. and Dr. *Hammond*'s 'diſſert. 3. c. 8.—*Illud cuivis notum eſt, omnem circum'jacentem regionem ad Epiſcopum civitatis antiquitùs per'tinuiſſe*, — *& Docti viri in unius regionis Eccleſiâ non 'niſi unum altare antiquitùs fuiſſe crediderunt, juxta præ'ſcriptum Judæorum ritum quibus licet plurima ſynagoga, 'unicum tamen templum, & altare, quod omnibus totius 'gentis incolis patebat: Sic, ut* Ignatius ἓν θυσιαστήριον and 'ἕνα Ἐπίσκοπον (*in* Ep. *ad* Philadelph.) *rectiſſimè* conjun'xerit. —And ſee what is ſaid of *Marcellus* Biſhop of 'Rome about *A. D.* 300. *in libro* Pontificali: *Hic fecit 'cœmiterium in viâ Salariâ, & 25. titulos in urbe Româ 'conſtituit; quaſi diœceſes, propter baptiſmum, & pœnitentiam 'multorum, qui convertebantur ex Paganis, & propter Se'pulturas Martyrum.* [*Titulos* i.e. Churches where Presbyters

'byters ſhould officiate (called *Tituli* from ſome name, given them, or ſign placed there, as the Croſs, a Martyr's relicks, &c, as a memorial of their dedication to the Church's ſervice). — *Presbyter Paſtor titulum condidit, & dignè in domino obiit — & ſoror noſtra Euprepia titulum domus ſuæ pauperibus* (*i. e.* to the Clergy) *aſſignavit, ubi nunc cum pauperibus noſtris commorantes, miſſas agimus*, ſaith *Pius*, in his two Epiſtles to *Juſtus Viennenſis*. And — Jacob *tulit lapidem, & erexit in Titulum* ſaith the Vulgar *Gen.* 28. 18. Such Titles there were before *Marcellus* in the time of *Dionyſius A. D.* 260. of *Pius* A. D. 158. of *Euariſtus* A. D. 96. but not ſo many. *Propter baptiſmum & pœnitentiam* [i. e. hearing confeſſions, &c.] *& ſepulturam*: For at the firſt there ſeems to have been no preaching, nor Altar, in thoſe *Tituli*, but in the Mother-Church, or place of aſſembly, where the Biſhop reſided. And *Juſtin*, who was a Profeſſor of Philoſophy in *Rome*, ſeemeth to intimate, that it was ſo, there, in his time, in thoſe words of his forecited §. 47. *n.* 1. — *Solis die, omnium, qui vel in oppidis vel ruri degunt, in eundem locum conventus fit.* In whoſe time *Teleſphorus*, Biſhop of *Rome* before *Hyginus*, who is firſt ſaid, *compoſuiſſe clerum, & diſtribuiſſe gradus*, ſeemeth alſo to be the προεδρος, who then officiated in this Mother-Church.

You may yet further obſerve to the ſame purpoſe; that, the extent of ſeveral Biſhopricks anciently being very narrow, and, in ſuch a paucity of Chriſtians, having but a few Subjects, [*apud alias nationes reperias, ubi & in pagis Epiſcopi ordinantur*, ſaith *Sozomen*; and therefore it is reſtrained in *Conc. Sardic.* c. 6. *ne ordinetur Epiſcopus aut in vico aliquo, aut in modicâ civitate, cui ſufficit unus Presbyter, quia non eſt neceſſe ibi Epiſcopum fieri, ne vileſcat Epiſcopi nomen & authoritas*], therefore the Biſhops, in ſome ſmaller Cities, had very few Presbyters with them, ſometimes only one, and ſometimes perhaps none. See the caſe that was propoſed by *Aurelius* the Biſhop

§. 63. *n.* 4.

l. 7. *c.* 19.

'ſhop in the 3. *Conc. Carth.* A. D. 397. c. 45. where 'it is declared lawful for the Primate to take any 'Biſhop's Presbyter, (though ſuch Biſhop had but 'one) to ordain him a Biſhop of a Church that wanted; 'or to remove him to a larger Epiſcopal Dioceſs, where 'more want of Presbyters: and the reaſon is there gi-'ven thus,—*Epiſcopus unus eſſe poteſt, per quem, dignati-'one divinâ, Presbyteri multi conſtitui poſſunt* [where 'note the Biſhop's ſingle Ordination of Presbyters] *unus 'autem, Epiſcopus, difficilè invenitur, conſtituendus. Qua-'propter, ſi neceſſarium Epiſcopatui quis habet Presbyte-'rum, & unum (ut dixiſti frater) habuerit, etiam 'ipſum ad promotionem dare debebit* (but if every Epiſ-'copal See had many Presbyters, what needed 'this going to another See?): where it is likewiſe or-'dained; that, another Church abounding in Clerks, 'the Biſhop, that wants a Presbyter, may receive from 'thence, and ordain, one of them.—And (in *Poſſidius 'de vitâ Auguſt.*) *Valerius* Biſhop of *Hippo* ſeemeth to 'have been deſtitute of a Presbyter, at leaſt for that 'City, when S. *Auſtin*, coming caſually thither, and 'his worth known, was ſuddenly apprehended by the 'people, and promoted to this Office, *Presbyter civita-'tis.—Cùm Valerius, flagitante Eccleſiaſticâ neceſſitate, de 'providendo* Presbytero civitatis *plebem Dei alloqueretur, '&c, manu injectâ* Auguſtinum *Epiſcopo ordinandum in-'tulerunt, &c: conſolantes ac dicentes, quia locus Pres-'byterii, licet ipſe majori dignus eſſet, appropinquaret ta-'men Epiſcopatui*, though S. *Auſtin* indeed, (when Bi-'ſhop there) had afterward many Presbyters under 'him, and out of them furniſhed Biſhops to many *A-'frican* Churches, that wanted.—And ſee (in the 'Comment in 1 *Tim.* c. 3. aſcribed to S. *Ambroſe*,) 'one end, if not the chief, of making Presbyters, that, 'according to the multiplying of Chriſtians, and ſo of 'Churches in the ſame Biſhop's See, there might be 'Clergy ſeverally to attend in them—Thus he, 'there, of the *Roman* Biſhop's See.—*Nunc autem*

ſeptem'

septem Diaconos esse oportet, aliquantos Presbyteros, ut bini sint [I suppose he meaneth one Presbyter and one Deacon] *per Ecclesias, & unus in civitate Episcopus.* Where, speaking of the employments also of those Presbyters in these Churches, he thus goeth on. *Ac per hoc omnes à conventu fœminæ abstinere debere, quia necesse est eos quotidie præsto esse in Ecclesiâ, &c. Omni enim hebdomadâ offerendum est, etiamsi non quotidie peregrinis,* [done it seems as often, as these sollicited] *incolis tamen, vel bis in hebdomadâ; & non desunt qui, propè, quotidie baptizentur ægri* [Children, or new Converts]. By what hath been said you see, that the Bishop, in the Church wherein himself officiated, might have been without the assessorship of a Presbyter; but never was he without the attendance of Deacons. And therefore sometimes is the Bishop and Deacon only named in the Church's Ministery, and the Presbyter omitted; the Bishop and the Presbyter performing the same Office in the Service, the Deacon a diverse.]

This, * touching the Bishop's being anciently both the chief, and the most common Actor of all Sacerdotal Functions in his *Paroecia*; and * touching the things which Presbyters in ancient times ordinarily did not in the Bishop's presence; nor might do without his licence. But, 2ly. other Ecclesiastical Acts, I said, there were, which they might not do at all. Which *Damasus* in his time reckoned up to be these.---*Eis* [Chorepiscopis sive Presbyteris] *non licet sacerdotes consecrare, nec Diaconos, aut subdiaconos, nec Virgines, nec altare erigere, nec ungere, aut sacrare, nec Ecclesias dedicare, nec Chrisma conficere, nec chrismate baptizatorum frontes signare, nec publicè quidem in Missâ quenquam pœnitentem reconciliare, nec formatas Epistolas mittere.* And, by *Leo*, they are set down much-what in the same manner. *—Quædam tamen authoritate veteris legis, quædam novellis & Ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita noverint: sicut Presbyterorum & Diaconorum, aut Virginum consecratio.*

—Nec

§. 64. n. 1. 2.

2. Not to exercise some Ecclesiastical Functions at all.

Ep. 4. de Chorepiscopis.

Ep. 86.

—*Nec erigere eis altaria, nec Eccleſias vel altaria conſecrare licet, nec, per impoſitiones manuum, fidelibus baptizatis, vel converſis ex hæreſi, Paracletum Spiritum Sanctum tradere, nec chriſma conficere, &c. Hæc enim omnia illicita ſunt Chorepiſcopis, qui ad exemplum & formam 70. Diſcipulorum eſſe noſcuntur, vel Presbyteris, qui eandem geſtant figuram.* None of theſe might Presbyters do, except by ſome extraordinary delegation from the Biſhop, and that only for ſome of them.

§.64.n.2. Amongſt others, theſe 4 proper to the Biſhop.

Now, amongſt the Eccleſiaſtical Acts belonging to the Biſhop, the chiefeſt ſeem to be theſe; 1. The Ordinations of Churchmen. 2. The Conſignation or Confirmation of the baptized. 3. The inflicting of cenſures. 4. And the cuſtody and diſpoſal of the Church's Revenue and the People's Offerings. All which we may find appropriated to them, not only in latter, but in the firſt, times.

CHAP. V.

§.65.n.1. 1.Ordination.

1. FOr Ordinations; * though uſually theſe were not performed by the Biſhop alone privately; leſt ſo, unworthy Perſons, whoſe evil manners were not ſo well known to him, as to ſome others, ſhould be promoted; but by him, joined with a Council of his Clergy, and before an Aſſembly of the Laity alſo, (both Clergy and People being conſulted concerning the fitneſs of the Perſon to be ordained;) * and though in the Ordination of Presbyters, the Presbyters, in ſome Churches, and times, together with the Biſhop laid on hands, whilſt he alone pronounced the Benediction: (See more of this below §. 102. n. 1.) Yet ſuch Ordinations are never found, in any Age, to have been conferred by any Presbyter, (acting either by his own, or by a delegated Power) without the Biſhop, unleſs ſuch pretended himſelf a Biſhop (though the Biſhop did ſometimes

times ordain without Presbyters): And if any other than a Biſhop ſhould preſume to give Orders, theſe were accounted invalid, and void, and the perſon re-ordained.

[For theſe things, ſee firſt, the *Apoſtolical Canons* [* the Author of which Canons (uncertain how Ancient, but at leaſt of the third age, as *Blondel* granteth *Apol. pro Hieron.* p. 157.) ſeemeth to have reduced into one body the former rules and cuſtoms of the Church: which Canons alſo are called *Regulæ* and *ſtatuta Eccleſiaſtica*, ▵ *in Conc. Nic.* c. 15. 16. referring to *Apoſt. Can.* 14. 15. and before this, ▵ in *Conc. Gang.* both in the Preface, and in the concluſion thereof; and are mentioned by *Conſtantine*, in *Euſeb. de vitâ Conſtant.* l. 3. c. 59. relating to *Can. Apoſt.* 14. And, in *Cyprian*'s days, we find *Novatianus*, † at *Rome* ambitious of the Biſhoprick, diligently ſeeking out three Biſhops to ordain him, according to *Can. Apoſt.* 1. This for their Authority and antiquity becauſe I often quote them]. Now the firſt Canon of theſe is; —*Epiſcopus à duobus aut tribus Epiſcopis ordinetur*—and the ſecond; *Presbyter ab uno Epiſcopo ordinetur, & Diaconus, & reliqui Clerici.* And agreeable to theſe are thoſe of the Councils following. — * *Conc. Nic. can.* 19.—*Clerici à* Paulianiſtis *ad Eccleſiam Catholicam confugientes ordinentur ab Epiſcopo:* And he ſolely named, as ſufficient for the Ordination.— * *Conc.* Antioch. *c.* 9.—*Unuſquiſque Epiſcopus habeat ſuæ Paroechiæ poteſtatem, ut Presbyteros & Diaconos ordinet*, &c. — * *Conc. Chalced*, a general Council, *can.* 2. —*Si quis Epiſcopus per pecuniam ordinaverit Presbyterum aut Diaconum, gradus ſui periculum ſubeat*; [here is the Biſhop only cenſured, as being the ſole Ordainer] and *can.* 6.—*Eos, qui abſolutè* [without any certain Title or Employment] *ordinantur, decrevit ſancta* Synodus *vacuam habere manus impoſitionem, & nullum tale factum valere ad injuriam ipſius*, [to be forced to maintain them], *qui eos ordinavit.* [Manus, & Ordinatoris, in the ſingular number]—

§ 65. *n.* 2.

† Apud *Euſeb.* l. 6. c. 42.

* *Conc.*

'* *Conc. Hiſpal. ſecundum*, a Spaniſh Council about 'A. D. 620.—*Epiſcopus enim Sacerdotibus & miniſtris* 'ſolus [ſine Concilio] *honorem* dare *poteſt*, *auferre* '*ſolus* [ſine examine Concilii] *non poteſt*. — Add 'to theſe, that paſſage cited before § 63. *n.* 4. out of 'the third *Conc. Carthag.* c. 45. *Per unum Epiſcopum* '[*i. e.* ſine Presbyteris] *dignatione divinâ Presbyteri multi* '*conſtitui poſſunt*, &c.'

§ 65. *n.* 3. 'To theſe Canons joyn we the practice of ς. *Cy-* 'prian, one in this matter much pretended to by the 'Presbyterians; who, △ though he profeſſed a lau- 'dable cuſtom of conſulting firſt the Clergy, and Peo- 'ple, concerning the perſons to be ordained; and of 'performing this ceremony in their preſence, and 'with their Approbation [ſee Ep. 33. directed, *Pres-* '*byteris, Diaconibus, & plebi.*—*Ordinationibus Cleri-* '*cis, fratres Chariſſimi, ſolemus vos ante conſulere, &* '*mores ac merita ſingulorum communi conſilio ponderare*: '*ſed non ſunt expectanda teſtimonia humana*, &c.] nay; '△ though alſo he called it, (from *Act.* 1. 15.--6. 2.) 'a Divine Tradition, and Apoſtolical Obſervation, to 'this, *plebe præſente*; [ſee Ep. 68.—*Propter quod* '*diligenter de traditione divinâ & Apoſtolica obſerva-* '*tione obſervandum eſt, & tenendum, quod apud nos* '*quoque & fere per univerſas Provincias tenetur, ut ad* '*ordinationes ritè celebrandas, ad eam plebem, cui Præ-* '*poſitus ordinatur, Epiſcopi ejuſdem Provinciæ proximi* '*quique conveniant, & Epiſcopus deligatur, plebe præ-* '*ſente, quæ ſingulorum vitam pleniſſimè novit*, &c.]: Yet, 'where the worth of the Perſon was aſſuredly known 'to him, or ſome neceſſity required it, ordained he, 'without the Clergie's aſſiſtance, or the People's pre- 'ſence. So, Ep. 124. He ordaineth ſolely * *Saturus* 'a Reader, and * *Optatus* a ſub-Deacon——Ep. 35. '* *Numidicus* a Presbyter— Ep. 33. * *Aurelius* a Rea- 'der. Where note alſo, that not one only, but 'many, Biſhops co-aſſiſted (freely, not neceſſarily) 'at the Ordination of inferior Clergy: For, in the

'ſame

ſame Epiſtle, he ſaith of this Reader [*Hunc* [Aurelium] *igitur, fratres dilectiſſimi, à me & à collegis* [Biſhops always, not Presbyters, called ſo by him] *qui præſentes aderant, ordinatum ſciatis.* —And *Euſebius* ſaith of *Origen*, that, *celeberrimi per* Palæſtinam *Epiſcopi*, Cæſarienſis & Hieroſolymitanus *manus illi ad Presbyterium impoſuerunt.* — Again, joyn we with *Cyprian Cornelius* his contemporary: who relateth, how *Novatianus* was ordained Presbyter by the Biſhop, *quum ab omni clero; immo & multis Laicis, ne id faceret, prohiberetur* [therefore the Presbyters, here, laid on no hands together with the Biſhop]. In the ſame Chapter likewiſe, ſee *Novatianus* his ſeeking out three Biſhops, ſo early before the *Apoſtolical Canons* are ſaid by *Blondel* to have been compiled, to make his Epiſcopal Ordination juſtifiable, according to the firſt of thoſe Canons. —And ſee in the *lib. Pontificali Damaſi*, as it is called, a relation of the Ordinations in the Church of *Rome* made, from the very beginning, by the Biſhops thereof. —Clemens *fecit Ordinationes duas, Presbyteros decem*, &c.

Euſeb. l. 6. c. 7.

Apud Euſeb. l. 6. c. 42.

Laſtly, *Blondel* (*Apol.* p. 345.) in conſideration of the Canons above-named, concedes this ſole Ordination by Biſhops, for ſome Churches, and times; and only contends, non ubique Epiſcopum ſolum *manus ordinandis ex officio impoſuiſſe*; and elſewhere (p. 159.) ſpeaking of the Biſhop of *Rome*'s manner of Ordination in *Conſtantine*'s time, he concedes; *Soli (ex more) manus imponebant*; only contends—*non extra publicum fraternitatis conventum.* ‖ Which *conventus fraternitatis* to be *ex more*, we alſo agree.

§. 65. *n.* 4.

‖ *Ex Conc.* Rom. *ſub* Sylveſtro.

There are indeed two or three Canons urged to prove, that Ordination by Biſhops, without the aſſiſtance of their Presbyters, was anciently forbidden, and oppoſed. —*Viz.* * 4. *Conc. Carthag.* c. 20. *Ut Epiſcopus, ſine conſilio Clericorum ſuorum, clericos non ordinet, ita ut civium aſſenſum conniventiam & teſtimonium*

§. 65. *n.* 5.

'*monium quærat.* —And * *Conc. Rom. ſub* Sylveſtro '*——Commonemus, ut nulli Epiſcopo liceat quemlibet gradum* 'Clerici *ordinare aut conſecrare, niſi cum omni adunatâ* 'Eccleſiâ. ——* *Synod. ad Quercum* (i. e. *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and ſome other Enemies to S. 'Chryſoſtome, met together) accuſing him that he made 'Ordinations without the company and ſentence of 'his Clergy.—— But above all, * 4. *Conc. Carthag.* c. 2. '*Presbyter cùm ordinatur, Epiſcopo eum benedicente, ma-* 'num *ſuper caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui* 'præſentes *ſunt, manus ſuas, juxta manum Epiſcopi, ſuper* 'caput *illius teneant.* To which is added a paſſage out of *Firmilian*'s Epiſtle to S. *Cyprian.* Who 'ſaith; *Omnem poteſtatem, & gratiam, in Eccleſiâ conſti-* 'tutam *eſſe, ubi præſident majores natu* ['tis probable, 'in *Firmilian*'s Language, πρεσβύτεροι] *qui & bapti-* 'zandi, *& manum imponendi, & ordinandi poſſident po-* 'teſtatem. ——*R.* But, if we conſider, the Canons here 'cited, well; ſome of them (*Conc. Rom. & 4. Conc.* 'Carth. c. 20.) require the Presbyter's preſence, aſſi-'ſtance, conſent (as they do alſo of the Deacons 'and People) for judging of the fitneſs (eſpecially as 'to their manners) of the Perſons to be ordained, not 'for performing the Office of Ordination; as appeareth 'alſo out of the forecited places of S. *Cyprian.*—— 'And upon this ground it was, that S. *Chryſoſtom* was 'accuſed for Ordaining without a Council of his Cler-'gy. Which Article againſt *Chryſoſtom Photius*, in 'his *Bibliotheca* (*Art.* 24.), expreſſeth only thus.—— '*Quod multos*, ἀμαρτύρους, *ordinavit*: That he or-'dained many, that had no Teſtimonials, (*i. e.*) from 'his Clergy, and others, to whom their former con-'verſation was better known, than to the Biſhop. (See 'of this more below §. 102. *n.* 1.). As for the laſt 'of the Canons cited, (4. *Conc. Carthag.* c. 3.) It re-'quireth further, the Presbyter's impoſition of hands: 'but firſt permits not to them the benediction, the 'chief act of this Ceremony: and 2ly. being but a

Apud Cypri-an. *Ep.* 75.

'Canon

Canon of a Provincial Council, requireth this only in the *African* Churches; not obſerved elſewhere. (See *Blondel*'s former Conceſſions, and the other Quotations, ſhewing the common practice, then, otherwiſe): and 3ly. this Canon, made about *A. D.* 136. is the firſt, that requireth it there: and 4ly. there it did not in every Dioceſs oblige; as where the Biſhop is ſuppoſed to have no Presbyters with him; for then he might ordain alone; (See what is quoted before out of the third *Conc. Carth.* ‖): 5. laſtly, the Canon requireth not ſuch impoſition of the Presbyter's hands upon any neceſſity, but only for the greater ſolemnity of this action (which therefore is obſerved ſtill in moſt Churches). For ſurely no neceſſity, that all Presbyters preſent ſhould lay on hands, ſince, in the modern Presbyterial ordinations, the impoſition of one Presbyter's hands, the reſt aſſenting, is held ſufficient by *Blondel* (Apolog. 157. p. 166.) and by *Calvin*; ‖ much more then, the impoſition of the Biſhop's hands ſufficeth, who is a Presbyter and ſomething more. As for *Firmilian*'s ſaying; Thoſe words going before in the ſame Epiſtle, [*Per ſingulos annos, Seniores, & præpoſiti, in unum convenimus*] and the words following, [*Quod totum nos jampridem in* Iconio *qui* Phrygiæ *locus eſt, collecti in unum*, &c, *confirmavimus*] both ſpoken of Provincial Councils, conſiſting moſt, or only, of Biſhops, and after this, theſe words: [*Hi quidem Epiſcopi, per manus impoſitionem, dant Spiritum Sanctum*] I ſay, theſe places do ſhew, that in the other, by his Preſident, Presbyters, or *Majores natu*, he meaneth Biſhops.

‖ §. 65. *n.* 2.

‖ *Inſtit.* l. 4. c. 3. Sect. 16.

This chiefly concerning Biſhop's ſole Ordination of Presbyters. Now to go on, and ſearch more particularly concerning Presbyter's preſuming to ordain Presbyters; firſt * ſee the noted caſe in the ſecond *Conc. Hiſpal. can.* 5. concerning a Presbyter's only reading the Benediction, in an Ordination, for the ſore-eyed Biſhop, whilſt the Biſhop ſingly laid on his hand:

§. 65. *n.* 6.

'hand: Upon which, it was ſentenced. *Hi* [the or-
'dained] *gradum Sacerdotii, vel Levitici ordinis,*
'*quem perversè adepti ſunt, amittant:* The Presbyter
'that read the Benediction eſcaping cenſure, becauſe
'deceaſed.

§. 65. n. 7. '* See *Damaſus* Ep. 4. concerning the *Chorepiſcopi*,
'△ ſome of whom, in ſome times, and places, ſeem to
'have had Epiſcopal Ordination, (χειροθεσίαν Ἐπισκόπων
'the Ordination proper to Biſhops) *Conc. Antioch.* c. 10.
'(Therefore we find theſe *Chorepiſcopi* indulged, in
'ſome times and places, ſeveral things denied to Pres-
'byters: as to ordain Deacons, ſub-Deacons, and
'Presbyters too, having the Biſhop's Licence; and to
'ſend *literas formatas*, or *Canonicas*. ib. can. 8. and to
'ſit, and ſubſcribe in Councils. And we find the
V. *Conc. Nic.* '*Novatian* Biſhops, that ſhould return to the
Conc. Epheſ.--- 'Catholick Church, not admitted to their former Bi-
Conc. Neocæſar. 'ſhopricks, but indulged to execute the Office of a
'*Chorepiſcopus*, in *Conc. Nic. can.* 8.) But this their
'Ordination was performed only by one Biſhop; and
'theſe, though eſſentially Biſhops, yet might ordain no
'Presbyters, or Deacons in the Country, without
'the City Biſhop's either preſence, or conſent. △ Some,
'again, ſeem to have been only ordained Presbyters,
'and theſe were prohibited to do any thing, that was
'above the Office of Presbytery. What is here ſaid
'will appear to you, if you diligently compare *Conc.*
'*Neocæſar.* c. 13. —*Conc. Antioch.* c. 10. —*Conc. An-*
'*cyran.* c. 13. and *Conc. Laodic.* c. 57. which is much-
'what the ſame with the *Ancyran* Canon. —Now a-
'gainſt thoſe *Chorepiſcopi*, (who, having only Presby-
'terial Ordination, and, miſtaking their place, from
'their Title, and from the ſuperintendency which they
'were intruſted with by the Biſhop in the Country,
'eſpecially for the overſight of the Poor, ſee *Conc.*
'*Neocæſ.* c. 13. and *Damaſus* in his Epiſtle, did pre-
'ſume ſometimes, in the ſame Country, to ordain
'Presbyters, and Deacons); againſt them, I ſay,

'*Damaſus*

Damaſus writes thus, concerning ordaining of Presbyters, and concerning other, then accounted, only Epiſcopal, acts. —— *Quicquid de rebus ad Epiſcopos ſolummodò pertinentibus egerint, neceſſe eſt, ut irritum fiat; quia, quod non habent, dare nequaquam poſſunt.* —— *Per illam illicitam manus impoſitionem vulneratum caput illi, qui videbantur aliquid accepiſſe, habebant: & ubi vulnus infixum eſt, neceſſe eſt medicinam adhibere, quâ infixa ſanetur macula, id eſt,* reiterari *neceſſum eſt, quod legitimè actum aut collatum minimè approbatur, ſi perfectum eſſe debebit.* — Thus *Damaſus. Neceſſe eſt, ut irritum fiat;* Not only, becauſe the *Chorepiſcopi* and *Presbyteri* are prohibited this by the Church-Canons, but becauſe in their firſt inſtitution they repreſent, not the Apoſtles, but the ſeventy Diſciples, *ſed ſeptuaginta diſcipulorum ſpeciem in Eccleſiâ gerunt.* So this Father, and ſo the Council of *Neocæſarea.* c. 13.—* *Reiterari neceſſum eſt*, before any ſuch may officiate; which ſhews, that Presbyter-Ordination, in this Fathers judgment, is not only void as to the exerciſe thereof (as Epiſcopal Ordinations alſo may be); but is null as to the Vertue, or effect thereof.— * *Quod non habent, dare nequaquam poſſunt:* For a Presbyter, to make another Presbyter, muſt have, not only the Order which he giveth, but alſo the power to give it. And for want of this ſecond it is, that one, who is a Knight, cannot therefore make a Knight; nor every one, that is confirmed, confirm another; for ſo *Laicks* might confirm; nor one, that is a Deacon, can therefore (in the Presbyterian's opinion) make a Deacon. Now this power, to give the Presbyterſhip, the Presbyters never received, (in theſe Fathers judgment) neither from the Apoſtles, neither from their Succeſſors, who immediately ordained them. Neither is there any ſuch thing in the form of their Ordination any more, than in that of a Deacon.

§.65.n.8. 'Aſcend we higher; * ſee in *Conc. Conſtant.* (the ſecond general *Conc.*) *Can.* 31. the Ordinations of *Maximus*, becauſe, though a pretended, yet really no Biſhop, made void. —And, before this again, * ſee the *Council* of *Alexandria* (held before the *Nicene*), declaring *Iſchyras*, and all others ordained by *Colythus*, a pretended Biſhop, but really only a Presbyter, to remain meer *Laicks* ſtill. *Hæc quidem* (ſaith that Synod) *à nobis dicuntur, non quòd* vel Schiſmaticum, [*i. e.* uſed by any *Meletian* Schiſmatical Presbyter] *poculum* Macarius *fregerit; ſed quod ibi omnino nullum fuerit. Quî enim fieri potuit, cum neque quiſquam ibi Eccleſiaſticus*, &c. [therefore *Iſchyras* was not ſo much as a Schiſmatical Clergy-man]: *Presbyter, qui fingitur adfuiſſe, eſt ille, toties rumoribus jactatus*, Iſchyras, *qui neque ab Eccleſiâ electus eſt Presbyter; neque, cùm à* Meletio *conſtitutos Presbyteros*, Alexander *in Eccleſiam recipiebat, in eorum numero unquam habi us fuit, aut ab eo* [by him or any Biſhop of his party, for there was the ſame reaſon of both theſe] *creatus. Quo pacto igitur Presbyter* Iſchyras? *Aut quo tandem authore conſtitutus? Nunquid ſcil. à* Colytho? *Atqui* Colythum *in gradu Presbyterii mortuum, omnemque ejus manuum impoſitionem reſciſſam, omneſque ab eo conſtitutos in Laicorum ordinem redactos eſſe, & ſub nomine laicorum ad Synaxin admiſſos, adeò apud omnes conſtat, ut nemo eâ de re dubitandum putet.* [This *Colythus* therefore was none of *Meletius* his Biſhops, whoſe Ordinations were not reſcinded, but thoſe, Ordained by him, received by *Alexander*, into the Church]. *Quomodo igitur homo privatus, privatas ædes inhabitans, poculum myſticum ſibi concreditum habuit*, &c.

Ap. Athanaſ. *Apol.* 2.

Apud Athan. *ibid.* 'The ſame is ſaid in the firſt Epiſtle of the *Mareotick* Presbyters. —— Iſchyras *nunquam ex ſacris Eccleſiæ comminiſtris fuit.* —— *Idem, cum talem ſibi titulum vendicaſſet, in* Alexandrinâ *Synodo depoſitus eſt, & cum laicis in ordinem redactus.* —— *ad iſtum igitur modum, inanis illi fama Presbyterii excuſſa eſt.* [depoſed, you

'ſee,

ſee, from a falſely aſſumed title only, not from any really-received dignity]. —— And in the ſecond Epiſtle. —— Iſchyram *ſecum adducebant, hominem minime Presbyterum, quippe ordinatum à* Collutho *quodam, non vero, ſed imaginario Epiſcopo, cui in Generali Concilio ab* Hoſio, *& à cæteris Epiſcopis juſſum fuerit, ut ſe pro Presbytero, qualis antea fuerat, haberet: atque ideo omnes ab illo conſtitutos in veterem ſuum ordinem* [Laicorum] *recurriſſe.* Here it is manifeſt: that *Iſchyras* was never any Presbyter, becauſe either never ordained, or ordained by one, that was only a Presbyter; and not a Schiſmatical, but only an imaginary, Biſhop; or, no Biſhop at all: And therefore *Iſchyras* depoſed, not from any order really conferred, but from a title vainly aſſumed; and hence, not condemned (as it is granted that the Clergy, upon great crimes, ſometimes were) *to a Laick Communion*; (i. e. to receive the Communion, without the Quire, amongſt, and in the ſame manner as, Laicks); but only reduced, and returning, to his former Laick condition; as his proper ſtation, not his puniſhment. And from this, I ſuppoſe, without further reply, will vaniſh thoſe miſts, in ſeveral leaves, raiſed by Mr. *Blondel* to obſcure this eminent Teſtimony, pretending, * that *Colluthus* was a *Meletian* Biſhop, and ſo a true, Biſhop (one Καλλυθ indeed was, ſo, ſee *Breviarium Meletii apud Athan. Apol.* 2. which he is pleaſed to take for this Κολλυθ) [contrary, to what is ſaid above; and to *Epiphanius*, who reports him an *Alexandrian* Presbyter; and to *Athanaſius*; who with *Epiphanius*, makes him the head of a Sect contradiſtinct to the *Meletians*]: —— and, * that *Iſchyras* was ordained by him a true Presbyter, [contrary, to what is ſaid above; and likewiſe to the Teſtimony of *Socrates*, who ſpeaks thus of him, —— *Iſchyras quidem facinus, quod multis mortis generibus multtandum fuerat, aggreſſus eſt. Nam, cùm nunquam ſacris fuiſſet initiatus, Presbyteri nomen ipſe*

'*ipſe ſibi impoſuit, Sacerdotiſque munera obire auſus eſt*:] 'Untill that both were by the *Alexandrian* Council de-'graded as Schiſmatical: and ſo *Colluthus*, from that 'time, reduced to a Presbyter: and *Iſchyras*, *ad Lai-'cam Communionem*, to become a Laick. Theſe are 'his fancies; as I ſuppoſe, ſufficiently diſpelled. 'Now to go on. Such as this ſentence of the *Alex-'andrian* Synod was for *Iſchyras*; ſuch was afterward 'the ſentence, the ſame *Hoſius* concurring, of the 'Council of *Sardica*, for thoſe ordained by *Muſæus* 'and *Eutychianus* (Presbyters, but pretended Biſhops) 'the ſo Ordained being by them numbred alſo among 'Laicks [*can.* 19. *Si laicum petiverint, non oportet illis 'denegari*]. Now it is true, that the Ordinations of 'Presbyters by thoſe really Biſhops were alſo many times 'voided ‖ (when theſe ſome way uncanonical) as to 'the Presbyters exerciſing of his office, but not, as to 'the annulling of his orders, or Presbyterſhip, and 'rendring him barely of the ſame rank and ſtation, as 'before he took them. And here alſo, you may note, 'that neither, the *Chorepiſcopi*, nor *Maximus*, nor *Co-'luthus*, nor any other, that I know of, in thoſe ancient 'times, had the face to ordain Presbyters, but as they 'firſt pretended themſelves Biſhops.

V. *Baljam. in can.* 19. and the *can.* by *Gentian Hervet.*

‖ V. *Conc. Chalced.* c. 6. *Conc. Antioch.* 13.

§. 65. *n.* 9. 'And therefore S. *Hierome* in the Latin Church, and 'S. *Chryſoſtom* in the Greek, when, (indulging the 'matter then in hand) they ſeem to ſpeak as dimi-'nutively as they could, of Biſhops, yet ſtill reſerve 'the power of Ordination to them untouched by o-'thers. *Quid facit* exceptâ Ordinatione *Epiſco-'pus* (ſaith *Hierome* ‖) *quod Presbyter non faciat?*—— '*Scilicet inter Epiſcopum* (ſaith *Chryſoſtom* ‖) *atque Pres-'byterum intereſt, fermè, nihil.*—— *Quippe & Presbyteris 'Eccleſiæ cura permiſſa eſt: & quæ de Epiſcopis dixit* '[Paulus] *ea etiam Presbyteris congruunt.* Sola '*quippe* ordinatione ſuperiores *illi ſunt, atque hoc tan-'tùm, pluſquam Presbyteri, habere videntur.* If 'you ſay, this ſuperiority in Ordination is ſpoken

‖ Ep. *ad Evagr.*

‖ *Hom.* 10. *in* 1 *Tim.* 3.

'perhaps

perhaps of the later Biſhops of their own times. ‘
Firſt, thoſe Biſhops, that were in theſe Fathers times, ‘ 1.
differed from Presbyters (ſurely) in ſeveral other things; ‘
(ſee that place of *Damaſus* cited before §. 64.); though ‘
yet chiefly in Ordination, ſome other Offices being on ‘
ſome occaſions delegated to Presbyters. But 2ly. this ‘ 2.
ſuperiority in Ordination theſe Fathers underſtood not ‘
only of their own, but of all former, times alſo; For ‘
the ſame *Chryſoſtom* expoundeth the *manus Presbyterii*, in ‘ *Hom.* 13. in
1 *Tim.* 4. 14. to be meant of Biſhops. *Neque enim* ‘ 1 *Tim.*
(ſaith he) *Presbyteri Epiſcopum ordinabant*; Then there- ‘
fore, in the Apoſtle's days *Chryſoſtom* held a difference ‘
of Biſhops from Presbyters for Ordination. —And S. ‘
Hierome alſo (as is ſhewed before §. 42. *n.* 4. and §. 60. ‘
and §. 132.) held Biſhops, in the modern notion, and as ‘
ſuperior to Presbyters, to be of Apoſtolical Inſtitution; ‘
and then I ask in his own words; in what could they ‘
then be ſuperior, if not in Ordination? See *Blondel's* ‘
Conceſſions concerning this (*Apol.* p. 167.) *Nemo verò* ‘
jure negaverit, &c. recited below §. 79. n. 1. And if ‘
theſe Fathers ſpoke of Biſhops thus ſuperior in their ‘
own days, yet we have juſt reaſon to preſume, they ‘
were ſo always before, if nothing be ſhewed in the ‘
former days, that ſaith the contrary. ‘

Laſtly, *Maſon* in his diſcourſe, wherein he endea- ‘ §. 65. *n.* 10.
voureth the defence of the Presbyterial Ordinations ‘
in the tranſmarine Reformation, though he holdeth an ‘
intrinſecal Power in Presbyters to ordain, yet he ac- ‘
knowledgeth it reſtrained by the Apoſtles themſelves ‘
who advanced Biſhops: *reſtrained*, ſaith he; ‖ *not utter-* ‘ ‖ P. 162.
ly extinguiſhed, as the faculty of the flying of a Bird, when ‘
her wings are tyed. The Apoſtles then tyed the Pres- ‘
byters wings; and the Church, that ſucceeded in the ‘
Apoſtolical Authority, never ſince hath thought meet, ‘
in her Councils, to looſe them. This is enough, and I ‘
know not, how any Inferiors can juſtifie or defend their ‘
cutting of this ſtring.] ‘

CHAP. VI.

§. 66. n. 1.

2. Conſignation, or Confirmation.

2. THis concerning Ordination: next, concerning Conſignation, or Confirmation of thoſe, who are formerly by Baptiſm admitted into the Church. The Biſhops only, as the Inheritors of this Power from the Apoſtles, have anciently been the ordinary Miniſters thereof; as that ſacred Ceremony, wherein the graces of the Holy Ghoſt are conceived to be conferred in a more copious manner, than they are in Baptiſme, on the rightly diſpoſed; and the Chriſtian *Neophyt*, then to be compleated and fitted for his warfare, and confirmed, with ſtrength in the holy Spirit, to overcome all Temptations, by the chief Paſtors of the Church, in their ſolemn Impoſition of hands and Prayer for him, Unction and Obſignation of him. [Which ordinarily was * performed by the Biſhop, in the Primitive times, immediately after Baptiſme, as likewiſe, after this, was the Euchariſt alſo given, to all ſuch (Infants, or others) as were baptized in the place of the Biſhop's reſidence, and at the ſolemn annual times of Baptiſme (*Eaſter* and *Whitſuntide*, becauſe of the Reſurrection in the one Feaſt, and the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, in the other): but * received by others at ſome diſtance after their Baptiſm, either by their reſorting unto the Mother Church, or expecting in the Country the Biſhop's Viſitation. (Of which Viſitation ſee S. *Jerom. adverſus* Luciferian. quoted below §. 66. n. 4.)]. This Holy Ceremony ſeemeth, to be mentioned in *Heb.* 6. 2. [*the Doctrine of Baptiſms and of laying on of hands*]; and in *Act.* 2. 38. [*Baptiſm*, and [after it] *receiving the gift of the Holy Ghoſt* [*i. e.* by laying on of hands]; and to be alluded to in 2 *Cor.* 1. 21, 22.— and 1 *John* 2. 27. Wherein,

Wherein, the Apoſtle's Succeſſors have ever ſince continued the Apoſtolical Practice (*Act.* 8. 15, 17. —and 19. 6.); and the Fathers given frequent teſtimonies of the neceſſary uſe and great benefit thereof. [*Multâ opus eſt virtute* (ſaith S. *Chryſoſtom* on *Act.* 8. 15.) *ut detur Spiritus Sanctus. Non enim idem eſt aſſequi remiſſionem peccatorum* [*i. e.* in Baptiſmo] *& accipere virtutem illam* [*i. e.* per impoſitionem manuum Apoſtolorum.] —*Melchiades* B. of *Rome* A. D. 311. Ep. *ad Epiſc. Hiſpan.* who conſulted him whether Baptiſm or this were the greater Sacrament, anſwers —* that this Sacrament, *quod à majoribus fit, id eſt, à ſummis Pontificibus, & quod à minoribus perfici non poteſt, majori veneratione venerandum & tenendum eſt.* — * That *Spiritus Sanctus in fonte* [baptiſmali] *plenitudinem tribuit ad innocentiam, in Confirmatione augmentum præſtat ad gratiam. —In baptiſmo regeneremur ad vitam, poſt baptiſmum confirmamur ad pugnam.* —S. *Cyprian ad* Januarium *Ep.* 70. — *Ungi quoque neceſſe eſt eum, qui baptizatus ſit, ut accepto chriſmate, id eſt, unctione, eſſe unctus Dei, & habere in ſe gratiam Chriſti, poſſit.* — and *ad* Pompeium *Ep.* 74. —*Porro autem non, per manus impoſitionem, quis naſcitur, quando accipit Spiritum Sanctum, ſed in baptiſmo* [naſcitur], *ut Spiritum, jam natus, accipiat* [per manus impoſitionem]. — Tertullian *de reſurrect. carn.* c. 8. — *Caro abluitur, ut anima emaculetur. —Caro ungitur, ut anima conſecretur. Caro ſignatur, ut & anima muniatur. Caro manus impoſitione adumbratur, ut anima Spiritu illuminetur: Caro corpore & ſanguine Chriſti veſcitur, ut & anima de Deo ſaginetur.* —So elſewhere *de Baptiſmo. —Ipſius Baptiſmi carnalis actus, quod in aquâ mergimur; ſpiritualis effectus, quod delictis liberamur. Dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans & invitans Spiritum Sanctum.* — and elſewhere *de Præſcription.* c. 36. denoting Baptiſme, Confirmation, and the Euchariſt, he ſaith, *Eccleſia aquâ ſignat, Spiritu Sancto veſtit, Euchariſtiâ paſcit. —S.*

'Ambroſ. *de Sacram.* l. 3. c. 2. *Sequitor ſpirituale ſig-*
'*naculum, quod audiſtis hodiè legi; quia poſt fontem ſuper-*
'*eſt, ut* perfectio fiat, *quando, ad invocationem Sacerdo-*
'*tis* [*Epiſcopi*], *Spiritus Sanctus infunditur.* To which I
'may add the two expreſſions in *Concil. Elibert.* (very
'ancient) ——*can* 38.——*Si baptizatus ſupervixerit, ad*
'*Epiſcopum eum perducat, ut per manus impoſitionem* per-
'fici *poſſit.* ——And *Can.* 77. — *Si quis ſine Epiſcopo*
'*vel Presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, Epiſcopus eos per be-*
'*nedictionem* perficere *debebit.* See likewiſe *Concil.*
'*Romanum ſub* Sylveſtro, quoted below §. 66. *n.* 5.
'——*S.* Aug. *de baptiſm.* l. 3. c. 16. *Spiritus Sanctus in*
'*ſolâ Catholicâ Eccleſiâ* per manus impoſitionem *dari*
'*dicitur.* Spiritus Sanctus, *i. e. divina charitas in*
'*eorum cordibus*, as he expounds it afterward. ——*Idem*
'*in* Pſal. 26. *Titulo pſalmi.* ——*Ad omnes Chriſtianos per-*
'*tinet unctio.* ——*Omnes ungimur*, &c. *Unctio iſta* per-
'ficiet *nos ſpiritualiter in illâ vitâ, quæ nobis promittitur.*
'——*Ungimur enim modo in ſacramento*, &c. Thus the
'Fathers, touching the ſingular vertue, and effect of
'Confirmation.]

Now of this Holy Rite, perfecting as it were and compleating our Baptiſme, that the chief Paſtors of the Church, the Biſhops, were anciently the ordinary Miniſters, the Fathers are likewiſe frequent Witneſſes.

§. 66. *n.* 2. '[See (not to go further downward to *Leo*, † *Johan.* 3. ‖ *Gregory*, †) Innocent. 1. *ad Decenn.*
'*De conſignandis infantibus manifeſtum eſt non ab alio quàm*
'*ab Epiſcopo fieri licere.*——*Hæc autem Pontificibus ſolis debe-*
'*ri, ut vel conſignent, vel* Paracletum *Spiritum tradant,*
'*non ſolùm conſuetudo Eccleſiaſtica demonſtrat, verum &*
'*illa lectio* Act. [8] *quæ aſſerit* Petrum & Johannem
'*eſſe directos, qui jam baptizatis traderent Spiritum San-*
'*ctum. Nam Presbyteris chriſmate* [*i. e.* in *vertice*, or, as
'ſome, in *pectore*, a Ceremony belonging to Baptiſm] *bap-*
'*tizatos ungere licet, ſed* [Chriſmate] *quod fuerit ab Epiſcopo*
'*conſecratum: non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo ſignare; quod*
'*ſolis debetur Epiſcopis, quum tradunt Spiritum* Paracletum.—

† Ep. 88. *ad Epiſcopos Germaniæ & Gal.*
‖ Ep ad *Epiſcopos Germaniæ & Galliæ.*
† l. 3. Ep. 9.

*See '

* See *Damaſus* before him Ep. 4. *de Chorepiſc.*—— *Quod autem ſolis Apoſtolis, eorumque ſucceſſoribus proprii ſit officii tradere Spiritum Sanctum liber Actuum Apoſtolorum docet, præſertim quum nullus ex 70. diſcipulis, quorum iſti* [Chorepiſcopi & Presbyteri] *ſpeciem gerunt, legatur donum Sancti Spiritus per manus impoſitionem tradidiſſe.* —— And ſee before § 65. n. 7. Where he declareth all ſuch Acts void and conferring nothing on thoſe they confirm, upon the Axiom.—— *Quod non habent*, &c. —— See S. *Ambroſe*, his contemporary, in the place before quoted § 66. n. 1. Where by *Invocatio* [*Sacerdotis*] he meaneth [*Epiſcopi*] as is uſual with him, (See before § 57.) and, as he ſtileth, in the precedent Chapter, Peter, *Sacerdos Eccleſiæ Romanæ.* —— See alſo S. *Auſtin de Trinit.* l. 15. c. 26.—*Orabant quippe* [Petrus & Johannes *Act.* 8.] *ut veniret in eos, quibus manus imponebant, Spiritus Sanctus, non ipſi eum dabant. Quem morem* in ſuis præpoſitis *etiam nunc ſervat Eccleſia.* § 66. n. 3.

Next ſee thoſe two Fathers, who are produced to make Biſhops *ſolâ Ordinatione ſuperiores*, Chryſoſtom *and* Hierom.——△ Chryſoſtom *Hom.* 18. in *Act.* 8.—— Philippus *baptizans Spiritum Sanctum non dabat. Neque enim facultatem habebat. Hoc enim donum ſolorum Apoſtolorum erat.—— Igitur hoc erat in Apoſtolis ſingulare, unde & præcipuos* [τὰς Κορυφαίους] *& non alios videmus hoc facere.* Now whom this Father meaneth, by Κορυφαίους, is clear, from what he hath ſaid before §. 55. of the Apoſtolical inſtitution of Biſhops.—— △ S. *Hierom, Dial. adverſ. Luciferian.* proving the Holy Ghoſt (that is, in a certain meaſure) to be conferred in the Church's Baptiſm before Confirmation, yet, acknowledgeth the uſe of Confirmation; granteth it to be done only by Biſhops; and to have taken its Original from what was firſt, * done by the Apoſtles (*Act.* 8. 17.) giving the Holy Ghoſt; and * done to the Apoſtles (*Act.* 2. 3.) receiving the Holy Ghoſt, and ſo to have deſcended to the Biſhops their § 66. n. 4.

* V. Dr. *Heylin* Hiſt. of Epiſcopacy. c. 6. p. 454.

'their Succeſſors: But this ſo deſcending *ad honorem Sacerdotii*, not *ad neceſſitatem legis*; i. e. not ſo, 'that Baptiſm is not entire without it, or that none 'ſhall, or can, receive the Holy Ghoſt, *i. e* in ſuch a 'manner, as is neceſſary for Salvation, before that 'they be confirmed; for then, what would become of 'the baptized, in places, where Biſhops come not, 'dying un-confirmed?——His words are. *Si in hoc 'loco quæris, quare in Eccleſiâ baptizatus, niſi per manus Epiſcopi non accipiat Spiritum Sanctum, quem nos 'aſſerimus in vero baptiſmate tribui, diſce hanc obſervationem ex eâ authoritate deſcendere, quod poſt aſcenſum Domini Spiritus Sanctus ad Apoſtolos deſcendit. 'Et, multis in locis, idem* [Epiſcopal Confirmation] *'factitatum reperimus, ad honorem potiùs Sacerdotii, 'quàm ad legis neceſſitatem. Alioqui, ſi ad Epiſcopi tantùm imprecationem* [in Confirmation, and 'not alſo, before, in Baptiſme] *Spiritus Sanctus defluit, 'lugendi ſunt, qui, in viculis, aut in caſtellis, aut in remotioribus locis, per Presbyteros & Diaconos baptizati, 'antè dormierunt, quam ab Epiſcopis inviſerentur.*—— 'And again.——*Non quidem abnuo hanc eſſe Eccleſiarum conſuetudinem, ut ad eos, qui longè, in minoribus 'urbibus, per Presbyteros & Diaconos baptizati ſunt, Epiſcopus, ad invocationem Spiritus Sancti, manum impoſiturus, excurrat.*—— And (*Ibid.*) he concedes this 'arguing of the *Luciferian* in behalf of Confirmation, and the Holy Ghoſt conferred therein.——*Exigis, ubi ſcriptum ſit? In* Actis *Apoſtolorum. Sed etiamſi Scripturæ authoritas non ſubeſſet, totius orbis in 'hanc partem conſenſus, inſtar præcepti, obtineret.* Here, 'we ſee Biſhops only confirming in S. *Hierom*'s days; 'and this Epiſcopal Confirmation held by him to be 'from Apoſtolical inſtitution. Therefore *Chryſoſtom*'s, 'and his, ſayings, before, §. 65. n. 9. *Epiſcopi ſolâ Ordinatione ſuperiores*, are to be underſtood with a *ferè*: 'as alſo the one uſeth the word Presbyter *facit*, not '*facit*: and the other *habere videntur*, not, *habent*; (though

(though further perhaps, S. *Hierom* held such a *potestas inchoata, imperfecta, & dependens à voluntate superioris*, to be in Presbyters for Confirmation, as *Bellarmin* ‖ also affirmeth; and as that saying of S. *Hierom* elsewhere, † *congruum* [Presbyteris] *confirmare*, intimates).—

Now to go on, and ascend higher. —— * See *Conc. Elibertin.* held in *Spain*, before that of *Nice*. *Potest Fidelis* [any baptized person] *baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum, ita, ut si supervixerit, ad Episcopum eum perducat, ut per manus impositionem perfici possit.* And see the same iterated in *Can.* 77. —— * See *Concil. Romanum* sub *Sylvestro in Epilogo.* —— Where it appoints —— *ut Presbyterum Arianum resipiscentem nemo susciperet, nisi Episcopus ejusdem loci eum reconciliaret, & sacrosancto chrismate, per Episcopalis manus impositionem, Sancti Spiritus gratiâ, confirmaret.* —— * See *Constit. Apostol.* written at the latest in the third age, *l.* 3. *c.* 16. —— *Tu Episcopus, vel tibi subjectus Presbyter, baptizabis eos*, &c. —— *ac virum suscipat Diaconus, mulierem Diaconissa, ut decorè traditio infrangibilis sigilli administretur: Postea Episcopus liniat baptizatos unguento.* And see his form of Benediction. *l.* 7. *c.* 43. 44. — * See S. *Cyprian* Ep. 73. *ad* Jubaian, —— *Quod deerat* [à *Philippo* diacono baptizatis] *id à* Petro, & Johanne *factum est, ut oratione pro eis habitâ & manu impositâ invocaretur, & infunderetur, super eos, Spiritus Sanctus. Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut, qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur, Præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, & per nostram orationem & manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, & signaculo Dominico consummentur.* —— * See *Cornelius*, Bishop of *Rome*, and S. *Cyprian*'s Contemporary, in his Epistle *ad Fabium* ‖ concerning *Novatianus* —— *Imò nec reliqua consecutus est post morbum, quæ juxta Ecclesiæ canonem consequi debebat, Obsignationem*, viz. *ab Episcopo collatam. Quem autem illâ potitus non sit, quomodo Spiritum Sanctum est consecu-*

‖ *De Confirm.* l. 2. c. 12. Sect. *sed instant.*

† Jerom. *Ep. ad Rusticum Narbon. Episcopum.* §. 66. n. 5.

‖ Apud *Euseb.* l. 6. c. 42.

'*conſecutus?* —— * See again, before S. *Cyprian* and '*Cornelius*, Pope *Urban* 1. A. D. 224. Epiſt. *Decret.* c. 7. '—— *Omnes fideles per manus impoſitionem Epiſcoporum* '*Spiritum Sanctum poſt baptiſmum accipere debent, ut* '*plenè Chriſtiani inveniantur*, &c. Laſtly, * ſee what *Cle*'*mens Alexand.* relateth of the Biſhop in S. *John*'s time, 'recited before §. 42. n. 8. which Biſhop, after he had 'baptized the young Man recommended unto him by the 'Apoſtle, the ſame youth *ad tantam poſtea obſervantiam* '*pervenit* (ſaith he) *ut eximium illi phylacterium, Obſig*'*nationem ſcil. Domini, adderet.* Thus that ancient 'Author, of a thing done in the Apoſtle's days.]

§. 66. n. 6. Such was the ancient Miniſter of Confirmation, or Obſignation. As for that Queſtion, whether this Confirmation thus conferred by the Biſhop, as in ancient times it uſually accompanied Baptiſm, ſo was not alſo then accounted ſome part of the Ceremonies belonging to Baptiſm (as *Spalatenſis*, *Rep. Eccleſiaſt.* l. 5. c. 5. *Daille*, and others, pretend, thereby to remove it further from aſſuming the title of a proper Sacrament), I ſhall not need to trouble you, or my ſelf, with it; ſo long as theſe things will be granted, which appear out of the former quotations. Firſt, That it was conferred always after the Baptiſm, and ſometimes at a long diſtance from it. 2. That it had a new ſuperlative effect attributed to it, differing from that of Baptiſm, or any other Rites uſed in Baptiſm. 3. That the Biſhop was the ſole ordinary Miniſter thereof.

§. 67. Thus was the ancient practice. But yet there is not, eſpecially if we deſcend to latter times, an equal Tradition in the Church for Confirmation, ſo indiſpenſably, and unſeparably, appropriated to the office of a Biſhop, as there is for Ordination. And there

1. wanteth not ſome ſhew of reaſon for it. For firſt, ſeeing that every ſingle Perſon, every Chriſtian, is a ſubject capable, and needfull, of receiving Confirmation; therefore it ſeemeth neceſſary, for proviſion againſt ſuddain

ſudden events, that there be ſome delegation of the exerciſe of this Function to ſome Presbyter in places, where either are no Biſhops, or, not ſo frequent. As you may ſee in the inſtances here following; the Iſland of *Sardinia*, and the *Indies*. But there ſeemeth to be no ſuch neceſſity, for Ordination; a thing of no haſty diſpatch; few Perſons being capable; no particular Perſons having a neceſſity, thereof: and the neceſſity, which any particular Church may have thereof, if ſhe uſeth only a prudential diligence therein, ſatisfiable in good time from Biſhops, though remote. For thus hath it been ſupplied often out of one Country to another, out of *Europe* to the *Indies*. 2. Again, for this moſt eminent Power of conſtituting Chriſt's Miniſter's, ſince the Catholick Church is divided, as it were, into ſo many ſeveral Folds, in each of which a Biſhop, (as Succeſſor from the Apoſtles therein) is the chief Paſtor, and hath the Grand overſight and Juriſdiction: and ſince he, that is ordained Presbyter to preach and adminiſter the Sacraments, muſt alſo receive, from one of theſe chief Paſtors, the Perſons, to whom; neither may be, by the Canons, ordained at random; it ſeemeth moſt meet, that he only, who can ſet theſe Miniſters on work, ſhould ordain them for the work; and not others ſet forth Labourers; who ſo perhaps muſt ſtand idle. 3ly. So high an Office, as the Prieſthood is, receiving ſo great Power both in *Corpus Chriſti myſticum*, Chriſt's Members in the Church; and in *Corpus Chriſti verum*, Chriſt's own Body in the Euchariſt, ſeemeth to require, for the ſole Miniſter of that Order, a Perſon the moſt amply dignified in the Church. *Sacramentum Ordinis aliquid excellentius, quàm Confirmationis. Aquin.* ‖ ‖ *Supplem.* q. 38. a. 1. Thus you have ſome conjectures, touching the reaſon of the Church's varying practice, (we ought to preſume, according to our Saviour's intentions) in the delegation of theſe two Offices of Ordination and Confirmation. Now to proceed.

2.

3.

§. 68. *n.* 1. 1. In looking after the latter Church's Practice; firſt we find, that there was a certain unction *in pectore*, or *in vertice*, with the ſame Chriſme, that was uſed in Confirmation, performed uſually, in ſome Churches at leaſt, (after baptizing) by the Presbyter; who, when, in the Biſhop's abſence, he baptized any, did alſo *Chriſmare*. See 1. *Conc. Tolet.* c. 20. —and *Conc. Arauſic.* c. 1. —and *Concil. Epaunenſ. Can.* 16. —But yet this muſt not be miſtaken for the unction, or Chriſmation uſed in Confirmation, which was done *in Fronte*, and only by the Biſhop: as appears, by *Innocentius* his words, before §. 66. n. 2. and *Gregory*'s, here following, §. 68. n. 3. —and by thoſe words in the *Arauſican* Canon —*De eo, qui in baptiſmate, quâcunque neceſſitate faciente, Chriſmatus non fuerit, in Confirmatione Sacerdos commonebitur*: —And by the judgment of *Leo* Epiſt. 88., agreeing with that of *Innocentius*; yet which *Leo* ratifyed theſe Canons, both of the *Council* of *Toledo*, and *Orange*.

§. 68. *n.* 2. 2. Again, mention is made, by the Author bearing the name of S. *Ambroſe* in *Eph.* 4. 11. (ſee below §. 76. *n.* 1.) —that in *Egypt*, *ſi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus, conſignant Presbyteri*: But this ſhews, that theſe Presbyters were ſingular in this: and no ſuch thing done elſewhere: nor doth any thing in that Author appear, whether this thing done in *Egypt* was juſtifiable.

§. 68. *n.* 3. 3. 3ly. We find in *S. Gregory*'s Epiſtles, that, upon his writing to the Metropolitan of *Sardinia*, and giving him, amongſt other inſtructions, this (*l.* 3. *Ep.* 9.)—*Presbyteri baptizatos infantes ſignare ſacro in frontibus chriſmate non præſumant*; And it being reſignified to him (*l.* 3. *Ep.* 26.) that ſome were grieved, and offended, at that his Prohibition: (probably, impatient, that, in the Biſhop's abſence, their Children remained long, or alſo dyed, unconfirmed); upon this, he gave leave, that, in the Biſhop's abſence, the Presbyter might *ungere in fronte baptizatos*. His words are, —*Pervenit quoque ad nos, quoſdam ſcandalizatos fuiſſe, quod Presbyteros*

teros chrismate ungere in fronte eos qui baptizandi [it should be *baptizati*, as appeareth by Ep. 9.] *sunt, prohibuimus. Et nos quidem secundùm usum veterem Ecclesiæ nostræ fecimus. Sed, si omnino hâc de re aliqui contristantur, ubi Episcopi desunt, ut Presbyteri etiam in fronte baptizandos chrismate ungere debeant, concedimus.* Which single example in antiquity (at least for the *Western* Church) raised the Controversie; whether the Pope in some cases, *ex plenitudine potestatis, quam habet in Ecclesiâ*, may not delegate the Power of Confirmation to a Presbyter: Some of note affirming it; upon which the Council of *Florence* ‖, first, and since, the Council of *Trent*, † perhaps for the eminency of the Controvertists on either side, waving the decision thereof, have said only; that the Bishop is the *Ordinarius minister Confirmationis*. Since which Councils also, what *Gregory* the I. conceded anciently to the *Sardinian* Presbyters, is said ‖ to have been conceded by *Gregory* XIII. to Presbyters in the *Indies*. For which also we find the Governour of *India* petitioning the same Pope by *Xaverius* (Ep. 3. to *Ignatius*). *Ut ad Christianam fidem in Indiâ stabiliendam, Episcopo faciat* [Pontifex Rom.] *potestatem Confirmationis suis Vicariis committendæ; cùm tam disjunctis locis unus Episcopus satisfacere, ut maximè velit, minimè possit.*——

‖ *De Sacram. Confirm.* † 7. *Sess.* c. 3. *de Confirm.*

‖ Zuarez. *in* p. 3. *t.* 3. *q.* 72. *disp.* 36. *Sect.* 2.

4ly. For matter of fact: In the Greek Church ‖ so now it is, that whoever baptizeth, though a Presbyter, is at the same time the Minister of Confirmation. And so it was, not only after, but for some time before, *Photius* his days, *A. D.* 867. For we find this one of *Photius* his criminations against the Roman Church † —*Quod Presbyteros linire baptizatorum frontes prohiberet*: of which, he would not have had the face, to accuse the Roman Church, unless the contrary Custom were then in his own. It is thought, that, after that the celebration of Baptism ceased to be at some solemn Festivals only in the year, when the Bishop was also present to confirm all the baptized, the Presbyters,

§. 68. *n.* 4.

4.

‖ See Goar's *Eucholog.* p. 360, 367, &c.

† Baron. *A. D.* 867.

leſt that the Children ſhould dye without this Sacrament, (which was then ſo highly valued), now when Baptiſm was celebrated at any other time, and ſo, frequently in the Biſhop's abſence, were, either by a general conſent of the Eaſtern Biſhops, allowed, or did of themſelves aſſume, the practice of it. But anciently, as the former Quotations ſhew, the Biſhops only conferred it in the Eaſtern Churches alſo.

§.68. *n.* 5. And many of note there be of latter times, in the Weſtern Church, amongſt whom is Pope *Adrian* VI. in 4. *Sent.* * who hold, Confirmation ſo intrinſecally belonging to the Office of a Biſhop, that the Church, or Pope, cannot diſpenſe with a ſingle Presbyter to confirm, in any caſe: and * who anſwer the place of *Gregory* thus: Gregorium *vitandi ſcandali cauſa, ceremonium illam quibuſdam Presbyteris ad tempus permiſiſſe: formam autem verborum huic Sacramento propriam illos uſurpaſſe, non apparere.* Others, though they hold the exerciſe of this power communicable to a Presbyter by diſpenſation; yet

1. Firſt, they confeſs the Biſhop to receive this power of Confirmation, not in his Sacerdotal, but in his Epiſcopal, Ordination or Conſecration [* in which Conſecration, the Biſhop is advanced to a Superior Order to that of Presbyter, as ſome of them ſay: that is, as order is taken *pro officio quodam reſpectu quarundam actionum ſacrarum.* See *Aquin. ſuppl. q.* 40. *a.* 5. Or, * in which Conſecration, the Biſhop is advanced to an higher degree of the Sacerdotal Order, as others had rather expreſs it.].

2. 2ly. Moſt of them do affirm, that without the Pope's Diſpenſation, or Commiſſion, a Presbyter's confirming is (not uncanonical and illicite, but) null, and void, and effecting nothing, according to what *Damaſus* hath ſaid, and *Conc. Trident.* ‖ 23. Seſſ. c. 4. ‖ alſo ſeemeth to ſay. *Quarum functionum* [Confirmationis, & Ordinationis] poteſtatem *reliqui inferioris Ordinis* nullam *habent.*—However, in ſuch varying of latter opinions, and practice, the Teſtimonies above do witneſs; that the Biſhops alone, anciently, uſed to confirm,

See Eſtius *in* 4. *Sent.* l. 17. *Sect.* 21.

firm, and founded it in Apoſtolical practice: who, had they eſteemed it a power appertaining, in general, to the Prieſt-hood, probably in ſo great a value which they ſet on this Sacrament, they would not have ſo totally prohibited to Presbyters the exerciſe thereof, where the Biſhop's abſence many times produced a perilous delay of this ſacred Ceremony, and death ſometimes prevented it.

CHAP. VII.

3. THus much of Conſignation or Confirmation. The third thing, I mentioned, was inflicting Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, and exerciſing Juriſdiction, not only over the Laity, but over the Clergy, and over the Presbyters themſelves. Which Cenſures, anciently we find, * impoſed, in the Church, not by the concurrent Juriſdiction of a Colledge of Presbyters, but by a ſingle Perſon, the Biſhop, with his *virgâ Apoſtolicâ*, as S. *Hierome* calls it (ſee before §. 60.); and, upon any appeal from the Biſhop's judgment (which appeal was not unuſual), * impoſed by a Synod not of Presbyters but of Biſhops: but we never hear of an appeal made either to a Synod, from, or from the Biſhop, to, the Colledge of the Presbytery. §.69.n.1. 3. Forenſick Judicature, and inflicting Cenſures.

I deny not here, that the Biſhops, who retained the power of judging only in themſelves (ſince they exerciſed it, as ſometimes with, ſo at other times without, their Presbyters), in theſe Juridical matters and cauſes, frequently had the aſſeſſorſhip of their co-Presbyters, and uſed the conſult and advice, not only of them, but of the Deacons, and People too, for the ſame reaſons, as are mentioned before in Ordination; *viz.* that more perfect information might be had, and fuller ſatisfaction given, and things firmlier eſtabliſhed, by an univerſal conſent. §.69.n.2.

conſent. Therefore we often find, * the City-Presbytery convened, and aſſembled, by the Biſhop, and thoſe ſometimes (where their Biſhop was a Metropolitan) joyned in Council with ſuch other Biſhops, as the Metropolitan could eaſily call to him: And, in thoſe Synods, * the Presbyters alſo giving their Votes, and ſuffrages, (and ſo the Deacons alſo) either conſultative, and deliberative; or alſo, in ſome matters, which were ordered by the Church-Conſtitutions not to be done without their conſent, decretive (if you will) and deciſive; but yet ſuch as were of no force, without, or againſt, the Biſhop's concurrence. In the ſame manner, as now the Biſhop of *Rome* calleth a Conſiſtory, and uſeth the aſſeſſorſhip and aſſiſtance of his Cardinals; or, as other Biſhops uſe the aſſiſtance of the Arch-Presbyter (or Dean) and the Chapter, without a parity of Authority: Or, as in the firſt Chriſtian Synod, (*Act.* 15.) the Apoſtles had the conſent alſo of all the Elders and Brethren of *Hieruſalem*, to the injunctions they ſent abroad, though the ſole Apoſtolical authority, ſufficient. —— 'Thus (in *Euſebius*) 'Cornelius is ſaid to have called ſuch a *Synod* about the 'Schiſm of *Novatianus*, where (ſaith he) —*Sexaginta* 'Epiſcopis, *ac pluribus Presbyteris, ac Diaconis, deinde &* 'ſeparatim *aliarum Provinciarum Paſtoribus, quid in hâc* 're faciendum ſit, *conſiderantibus, decretum ſtatuitur ab* 'omnibus, Novatum, *unà cum ſimul elatis, alienos eſſe cen*'ſendos *ab Eccleſia, &c.* —— And *Cornelius* himſelf *apud* 'Cypri. *Ep.* 46. writes thus. —— *Omni igitur actu ad* 'me perlato placuit contrahi Presbyterium. *Adfuerunt eti*'am *Epiſcopi quinque, ut firmato concilio, quid circa per*'ſonam eorum [ſome Converts from *Novatianiſm*] *ob*'ſervari deberet, *conſenſu omnium ſtatueretur.* —— Hence, 'S. *Cyprian* Ep. 55. ſtiles them. —— *Florentiſſimum Clerum* 'cum Cornelio *præſidentem.* —Hence, *Victor* in his Epi'ſtle to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Vienna*, calls them, *Collegium* 'Fratrum. —*ſalutat te Collegium Fratrum.* —And *Pius* 'A. D. 158. in his Epiſtle to *Juſtus* Biſhop of *Vienna*, 'calls

Euſeb. *Hiſt.* l. 6. c. 42.

calls them *Senatum.* —*Salutat te Senatus pauper Chriſti apud Romam conſtitutus.* ——Like inſtances we have in *Cyprian,* frequently uſing the Aſſembly of his Clergy, many times joined alſo with ſome Biſhops, in the tranſaction of Church-matters. See firſt that famous Provincial Council of *Carthage,* ‖ in his time, *de baptizandis hæreticis.* Where (ſaith the relation thereof) *Convenêre Epiſcopi plurimi ex* Provinciâ, Africâ, Numidiâ, Mauritaniâ, *cum Presbyteris, & Diaconibus, præſente etiam Plebis maximâ parte.* [But you may obſerve, that the Votes of the eighty ſeven Biſhops only are there ſet down, as judicial]: the like may be ſeen in 1. *Concil. Tolet.* and ſeveral others. See Ep. 28. directed to his Presbyters and Deacons, in the time of his receſs. —*Integrè, & cum Diſciplinâ feciſtis (fratres chariſſimi), quod conſilio Collegarum meorum, qui præſentes erant, Gaio Diddenſi Presbytero, & Diacono ejus, cenſuiſtis non communicandum,* &c. —*& Cui rei non potui me ſolum judicem dare* [in a certain matter of ſtipends], —*limanda plenius ratio, non tantùm cum Collegis meis, ſed etiam cum plebe.* —*&* Ep. 71. —*De quâ re* [rebaptization], *quid nuper in Concilio plurimi Coepiſcopi, cum compresbyteris qui aderant, cenſuerimus, ut ſcires, ejuſdem Epiſtolæ exemplum tibi miſi.* —See likewiſe Ep. 6. —*Ad id, quod ſcripſerunt mihi Compresbyteri noſtri, ſolus reſcribere nihil potui, quando à primordio Epiſcopatus noſtri ſtatuerim, nihil ſine conſilio veſtro, & ſine conſenſu plebis meæ, privatâ ſententiâ, gerere.* —*&* Ep. 33. *In ordinationibus Clericis, fratres chariſſimi,* [he ſpeaks here *Presbyteris, Diaconibus & plebi univerſæ*] *ſolemus vos ante conſulere,* &c. ——But theſe conſults of the Biſhop with others, you ſee, do include, both Deacons, and People, as well as Presbyters; and do run with a *ſolemus & ita apud nos ſtatuimus,* which argue the thing voluntary, not neceſſary. There was alſo a Canon made, but in latter times, (about *A. D.* 436.), and in a Provincial Council only, for the *African* Churches, 4. *Conc. Carthag.* c. 23. which runs thus. *Ut Epiſcopus nullius cauſam audiat abſque præſentiâ*

‖ *Apud* Cyprian.

'*sentiâ Clericorum suorum*; *alioqui irrita erit sententia Epis-*
'*copi, nisi Clericorum præsentiâ confirmetur.* But this in-
'volves Deacons, as well as Presbyters; and withdraw-
'eth not the Bishop's sole Authority of judging causes,
'(see *Can.* 55. and 59. —and 1. *Conc. Carthag.* c. 11.
'—and 3. *Conc. Carthag.* c. 8.) but only exacts, that this
'judgment should not be Clandestine, and in private.
'There are also two passages urged out of S. *Cyprian*'s
'eighteen and nineteen Epistles, the one with a [*soli*
'*mihi vindicare non audeo*], the other, with a [*ne videar*
'*aliquid temerè præsumere*]: but they are spoken, not
'singly of Presbyters, but Bishops also (for so *Collegæ*
signifies,) in a matter belonging to the consult of a
'Synod.]

§.69.n.3. This Concession being premis'd, concerning the Bishop's, in Ecclesiastical Censures, and other matters of Judicature, frequently consulting and advising with his Clergy; Now to go on, to shew you, that in these (notwithstanding) he both did, and might, act singly without them, and singly exercise his Jurisdiction both over them and the Laity. For this then, to omit Quotations out of latter Ages, where Episcopacy is granted to be ascended to its height, as the ninth *can.* of *Conc. Chalced.* —the thirteen and fourteen *Canons* of the *Council* of *Sardica*, and others; see, in the first place, the fifth *Canon* of the first *Nicene* Council. —*Si fortè* [Clerici vel Laici] *aliquâ indignatione, aut contentione, aut quâlibet commotione* [passion] *Episcopi sui, excommunicati sint, ut dignâ hæc possint examinatione perquiri, rectè visum est, per singulos annos in singulis Provinciis, bis in anno, Episcoporum Concilium fieri, ut ex communi sententiâ hujusmodi examinet quæstiones; ut ita demum hi, qui ob culpas suas Episcoporum suorum offensas meritò contraxerint, dignè etiam à cæteris* [Episcopis] *excommunicati habeantur, quousque, in communi, vel ipsi Episcopo suo, visum fuerit, humaniorem circa eos ferre sententiam.* Here you see, the Bishop, whether out of reason or passion, doth, as he seeth fit, excommunicate his Subjects, Presbyters or others: and afterward

ward a Synod only of Biſhops, not the College of Presbyters, calls his actions to account. —— Before this, ſee 33. *Can. Apoſt.* to the ſame purpoſe. —— *Si quis Presbyter, aut Diaconus, ab Epiſcopo ſuo ſegregetur* [or *excommunicetur*], *hunc non licere ab alio recipi, ſed ab ipſo, qui eum ſequeſtraverat, niſi forſitan obierit Epiſcopus ipſe, qui eum ſegregare cognoſcitur.* —— See the practice, of *Cyprian*, by his own ſingle authority, in his receſſe, excommunicating *Feliciſſimus* and *Augendus*, and others his Presbyters. Ep. 38, 39. And ſee this Fathers words Ep. 65. to *Rogatianus* a Biſhop, complaining to him (his *Metropolitan*), and to the reſt of a Synod, of an injurious Deacon.—*Tu quidem honorificè circa nos, & pro ſolitâ tua humilitate, feciſti, ut malles de eo nobis conqueri, cùm, pro Epiſcopatus vigore, & Cathedræ authoritate, haberes poteſtatem, quâ poſſes de illo ſtatim vindicari.*—*Si ultra te contumeliis ſuis exacerbaverit, & provocaverit, fungeris circa eum poteſtate honoris tui, ut eum vel deponas, vel abſtineas. Nam ſi Apoſtolus* Paulus *ad* Timotheum *ſcribens, dixit juventutem tuam nemo deſpiciat, quanto magis tibi, à Collegis tuis, dicendum eſt Senectutem tuam nemo deſpiciat.* —— See the practice of *Demetrius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, before theſe times, excommunicating his Presbyter, *Origen* (*Hierom* Adverſ. Ruff. l. 2).—— Before this again; of the Excommunication of the *Aſian* Church, about the obſervation of *Eaſter*, not the Colledge of the *Roman* Presbytery, but *Victor* only their Biſhop, bears both the name and blame (ſee *Euſeb.* l. 5. c. 23.). —— So that, what was acted by *Timothy* and *Titus*, in their ſingle perſons, concerning Judicature and Cenſures over Presbyters, as well as others, † the ſame ſeemeth to be continued in the Church by ſingle Perſons their Succeſſors; and, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory affording inſtances thereof in the next Age to the Apoſtles, it is to be preſumed to have been ſo always, when Church-Hiſtory hath delivered nothing to the contrary.

† v. before Sect. 38.

§. 70.

4. Disp sal of the Church's revenue.

The Fourth thing I mentioned, belonging anciently to the Bishops, was the custody and disposal of the Church's revenues, and the Peoples oblations. —Amongst which oblations we find also * the *primitiæ frugum & pecorum*, by *Origen* ‖, * *Decimæ, primitiæ frumenti, vini, Olei, Pomorum, lanæ*, by the Author of the Apostolical Constitutions †, * *non minùs quàm decima pars*, not only *frugum terræ, &c*, but also *lucrorum opificum*, by *Chrysostom*, expounding the Order of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. ‖ named as a due part of this income to the Bishop: (yet was this large revenue not so committed unto him, but that, in any greater distributions thereof, at least in some Churches, he was first to have the consent of his Clergy, acquainted therewith: See *Conc. Antiochen.* c. 25. —4. *Conc. Carthag. c.* 32.).

‖ *Hom.* 11. *super Numeros.*

† *l.* 2. *c.* 34.

‖ *In* 1 *Cor. Hom.* 43.

Now, of this dispensing of these Church-Oblations as belonging properly to the Bishop also, several ancient Canons make mention. To omit those of latter Councils (the 9. *Can.* of *Conc. Antiochen.* * and the 26. of *Conc. Chalcedon.*) see *Concil Gangrense* (before that of *Nice*) *Can.* 8.—— *Si quis dederit vel acceperit oblata præter Episcopum, vel eum, qui est constitutus ab eo ad dispensandam misericordiam pauperibus; Et qui dat, & qui accipit, Anathema sit.*—— And, before this, See the *Apostol. Can.* the 39. and 41. —*Omnium negotiorum Ecclesiasticorum curam Episcopus habeat, & dispenset.*—And—*præcipimus, ut in potestate suâ Episcopus Ecclesiæ res habeat, &c: ita, ut potestate ejus indigentibus omnia dispensentur per Presbyteros, & Diaconos.*—— And *Constitut. Apostol. l.* 2. *c.* 35.— *Cave, ne Episcopum ad rationes voces, neque dispensationem illius observes, quomodo eam gerat, aut quando, aut quibus, aut ubi, utrum bene, an secus: Habet enim ipse ratiocinatorem Deum, qui hanc illi procurationem in manus tradidit.* Agreeable to which is △ that passage in S. *Cyprian* (Ep. 34. *Presbyteris & Plebi*): Where he designs the Presbyters stipend to two worthy Confessors. —— *Cæterum Presbyterii honorem designasse nos illis jam sciatis, ut & sportulis iisdem* [allowance of money or other provision] *cum Presbyteris honorentur,*

honorentur, & diviſiones menſurnas, æquatis quantitatibus, partiantur.—And, Ep. 38. where he ſuſpendeth ſome Presbyters, for a time, *à diviſione menſurnâ.* And △ that paſſage in *Tertullian* ‖ — *Cui* [ſpeaking of relieving a poor maid] *ſi quid refrigerii debuerat Epiſcopus, &c.*—and *de jejunio* c. 13.—*Epiſcopi Univerſæ plebi mandare jejunia aſſolent, non dico, de induſtriâ ſtipium conferendarum, &c.* For, then, the people uſed to contribute their charities, which were committed to the Biſhop's diſpoſal. △ And the narration in *Juſtin Martyr* (ſee before § 47. *n.* 1.) of the προεστὼς—*apud quem deponitur, quod colligitur, atque ille inde opitulatur pupillis, & peregrè advenientibus hoſpitibus, indigentiumque omnium curator eſt.* —△ And the narration in *Clemens Alexandrinus* (before, § 42. *n.* 8.) of the Biſhop in S. *John*'s time, who, when S. *John* examined him about his *Depoſitum* (as he calleth him) the debauched Youth, that he committed to him, thought, he had queſtioned him about the Church-goods. By which two laſt inſtances You may ſee, how well former Practices, and latter Canons, agree; both being grounded on Apoſtolical practice, to whom at firſt was committed the cuſtody, and diſpoſal of the people's charity, and things devoted to God; and who looked on the care of the poor, as a ſpecial charge belonging to thoſe, who are the chief Maſters of God's Family, and whoſe authority hath moſt power to procure them relief. Though in this matter, they uſed, as alſo Biſhops did afterward, the miniſtry of Deacons. See *Act.* 4. 34, 35.—2. 45.—5. 2.—11. 30.—24. 17.—*Galat.* 2. 10.—*Rom.* 15. 25. 28.—1 *Cor.* 16. 1.—2 *Cor.* 8.

‖ *De Virgin. Veland.*

Part III.

CHAP. I.

§. 71. Episcopacy anciently opposed by *Aërius.*

THus, in all places whereof we have records, single persons succeeded the Apostles; advanced above Presbyters, not only in dignity, but Office and Authority; and that, in many several Functions; as hath been shewed you, (from §. 40.) through antiquity, not without some *tædium* to my self, and perhaps more to you, in a matter so evident. Such was the Church-Government in those first times, and such it continued for 1500. years, being never questioned or disturbed, I mean, as to denying the lawfulness, or as to endeavouring the change thereof, except, * by one *Aërius* (a Presbyter, that was put by a Bishoprick †) in the beginning of the fourth age (without any followers known to posterity): and, after 800 years more passed in peace, * by the illiterate *Waldeneſs*, or poor men of *Lions*; and, some say, since them, * by *Wickliffe*; but no such thing appears expressly either in those Articles of his condemned in the Council of *Constance* (Sess. 8.); or those condemned here in *England* (which see in *Foxe* p. 400), save only this; that he affirmed the Ecclesiastical Acts of Bishops, or other Clergy, who were wicked, to be vain and effectless.——and in saying (*Art. Constan.* 28.) that *Ordination* and *Confirmation* are reserved to Bishops out of ambition and covetousness, he seems to deprive their Prelacy of its chiefest pretensions. Now, as for *Aërius*; He was, in those ancient times, numbred in the roll of Hereticks: * by *Epiphanius* ‖, because he said,——

† S. *Austin. hæres.* 53.

‖ 1. *Tom. hær.* 75.

Quid

Quid est Episcopus ad Presbyterum? nihil differt hic ab illo. Unus enim est ordo, & unus honor, & una dignitas, &c.— profert autem ad errorem suum; quod Apostolus scribit Presbyteris & Diaconis, & non scribit Episcopis. Et ad Episcopum dicit; ne neglexeris donum, quod accepisti per manus Presbyterii.—& rursus in alio loco Episcopis & Diaconis *scribit; quare idem est (inquit) Episcopus & Presbyter.*——And, again, * by S. *Augustin*‖, for the same reason: because he said; *Presbyterum ab Episcopo nullâ differentiâ debere discerni.* And for the *Waldenses* of *Lions*, together with their associates of *Tholose*, and other places, they were both declared Hereticks by the Church, and suppressed by the secular powers, of those times. See *Concil. Lateranens. sub Alex.* 3. *part* 1. c. 27. compared with *Conc. Lateran. sub* Innocent. 3. *c.* 3. and see this confessed in *Jus Divin. Minist. Evang. p.* 49.

‖S Aug. *de Hær.* 53.

§. 72.

Of late by the *Presbyterians.*

Yet, now of late, have great storms been raised again, and this ancient and Reverend government called to a strict account by those, who first disceding in their opinions from the judgment of former times, and also of these Superiors, and hence many-wayes liable to Church-Censures, have perhaps therefore been the more unwilling to submit to more Church-Authority, than they think can some other way, than only by Antiquity, and prescription, justifie it self. Of whose plea and pretences, (chiefly) out of the Scriptures, but (somewhat) out of the Fathers too, which have so much troubled this last Age, and in it, most, this miserable Nation, I proceed now to give you the account, you desired.

Their Concessions.

§. 73. *n.* 1.

1.

1. *Timothy* and *Titus* his authority, * superior to Presbyters.

And, first, here is granted, by all sides, a singular authority, as to some things, namely, as to ordaining of Presbyters, and Deacons, and exercising censures over Presbyters and others, to have been given to *Timothy* and *Titus*, which was not given to all other Presbyters of the *Ephesian* and *Cretan* Churches; at least, in such a manner; (and therefore are these called, by the Presbyterians, *Officers extraordinary*);

I add; notwithſtanding, that the Apoſtle himſelf had firſt ſetled Presbyters at *Epheſus*, before that he committed to *Timothy* this ſuperior authority. See, for this, the Presbyterians firſt paper ſent to the King in the Iſle of *Wight*. *Oct.* 3. p. 3. 7. and ſecond paper, p. 10. *& Jus divinum* Miniſter. *Anglican.* p. 71, 72.

§. 73. *n.* 2. ['Neither indeed can it, rationally, be ſaid: △ either 'that every Presbyter of *Epheſus* or *Creet*, had, at the 'ſame time, an original power, unſuſpended by the A-'poſtle, to ordain other Presbyters in thoſe places; For 'this would render S. *Paul*'s charge to *Timothy*; *to lay* 'hands haſtily on no Man [i. e. to ordain them]: and to '*Titus*; *to go from City to City to ordain Presbyters*, need-'leſs and in vain. △ Or; that the Collective body of 'the Presbytery of *Epheſus*, or *Creet*, had, at the ſame 'time, the ſame authority committed to them over the 'Presbyters of thoſe places, as *Timothy* and *Titus* had: 'for, thus alſo, would there be two diſtinct ſupreme, 'and coordinate Governors, at the ſame time, ſet o-'ver the ſame perſons. And it would have been an 'occaſion only of contentions and tumults, to leave '*Timothy* at *Epheſus*, and *Titus* in *Creet* to exerciſe that 'authority, which the Apoſtle formerly, in the ſame 'places, had committed to another body, namely, the 'Presbytery. But, if we ſay, that this body of Pres-'bytery were to join, as ſubordinate aſſiſtants, with '*Timothy* and *Titus* in Ordinations, *&c*; *Subordinate* 'ſo, as that *Timothy* or *Titus* had a negative Vote; 'μηδὲν χωρὶς τῦ προθέν (without which Negative 'all thoſe charges of the Apoſtle to *Timothy* — *That* 'he ſhould not receive an accuſation againſt a Presbyter, 'ſave before two witneſſes: that he ſhould not prefer one 'before another; do nothing by partiality, nor lay hands 'ſuddainly on any, &c; as to the right government of 'that Church, are made to ſignifie nothing, if other 'Co-Governours might do all theſe things, as they 'pleaſed, without Him): This their aſſiſtance, I ſay, 'ſo ſubordinate, will no more deſtroy, here, *Timothy* and'

and *Titus* their ſuperiority, (the thing contended for), than, formerly, it did S. *Paul*'s (*2 Tim.* 1. 6. —*1 Tim.* 4. 14.); Or, doth now the Modern Biſhop's. But, in the mean while, if this ſubordinate aſſiſtance be claimed as, either *jure divino*, or *Apoſtolico*, the Presbyters due and neceſſary Right, it is fit, that they ſhew for it alſo, ſuch Commiſſion, or primitive practice, as *Timothy* and *Titus* and their Succeſſors do, for their functions. And that anſwer which is returned by the *Aſſembly of Divines* to the People, (ſince the later birth of the Fanaticks,) claming alſo a right to ordain, methinks, may here as juſtly be return'd to Presbyters claiming it. Now, to the people's claim the Aſſembly of *Divines* in their *Jus divin. Miniſt. Evang.* p. 185. replies thus. —*Mat.* 21. 23. By what authority do you theſe things, and who gave you this authority? *ſhew us your warrant out of the word*, &c. —*Why was* Titus *left in* Creet *to appoint Elders in every City? Might not the People ſay, what need* Paul *leave* Titus, *to do that, which we can do our ſelves?* Fruſtra fit per plura, &c. —*Add that, which to us ſeems to be of weight. That all that is written in the Epiſtles concerning the Ordainers, and the qualification of the ordained*, &c. *is all written in the Epiſtles unto* Timothy *and* Titus, *who were Church-Officers. In the other Epiſtles which were written unto the Churches there is no mention made of theſe things, which doth abundantly prove unto us; That the work of Ordination is a work belonging to Miniſters, and not to the People.* — *And they alone who have received this Church-Power from the Apoſtles can derive and tranſmit it to other Miniſters.* Thus they. You may be pleaſed to change only a word, and put Presbyter in ſtead of People, and ſee how they plead the Biſhops cauſe. *By what authority do you* Presbyters *theſe things, and who gave you this authority? — Why was Titus left in Creet, or Timothy in Epheſus* (after ſeveral Presbyters Ordained by the Apoſtle formerly

'ly in both places, when himſelf was reſident there) 'to ordain Elders? *Might not thoſe Presbyters ſay, what* 'need Paul *leave* Timothy *to do that, which we can* 'do our ſelves? *Fruſtra fit, &c. All that is written in* 'the *Epiſtles concerning Ordainers is written in the E-* 'piſtles to Timothy *and* Titus, *who were the Church-* 'Officers for this purpoſe, where is no charge or Com- 'miſſion given to any Presbyters concerning Ordain- 'ing (however it be that *Timothy* might uſe their ſubor- 'dinate aſſiſtance therein, as ſhould be thought fit); 'And in the other Epiſtles there is no mention made of 'theſe things: which doth abundantly prove, that the 'work of Ordination is a work belonging to Timothy, '[at leaſt, as the *ſine quo non*; or, as having the ma- 'jority of power in the Ordination, a thing which 'the Presbyterians deny to the Biſhop‖] *and not to the* 'Presbyters. *And they alone, who have receiv'd, can* 'tranſmit it. Thus the Presbyterian calls on the Fana- 'ticks to ſhew their Commiſſion; the Prelate, with the 'ſame reaſons, on the Presbyterians, to ſhew their's.]

‖ *Jus D.* part 2. p. 29.

§ 74. *n.* 1. 2ly. It is granted by all ſides; that this Authority, given to *Timothy* and *Titus*, for Ordination, and Judi-

2. cature, or Cenſures, was not to expire with them: but always to continue in the Church after them.

* 2. Not expiring with their perſons, but to be continued in the Church.

§ 74. *n.* 2. But, after theſe two things confeſſed; here, is the great queſtion made; △ whether this authority was committed to *Timothy* and *Titus*, as to extraordinary perſons, under the title of Evangeliſts; which authority after them (either at, or alſo before, their death) was to fall into the hands of the whole body of the Presbyters: Or, △ Whether it was committed to them, as to the Ordinary ſuperior Officers of the Church; in which authority, after their deceaſe, other ſingle perſons, ſuperior to the reſt of the Clergy, ought to ſucceed them. The former is affirmed by the

the Presbyterians. See their papers in the Iſle of *Wight*, *Oct.* 3. *p.* 7.—*Oct.* 17. *p.* 16.

3^ly. And here again: if (laying aſide the Canon of Scriptures) inquiry be made concerning matter of fact, what was done after the Apoſtle's times: whether ſingle Perſons, or the whole body of the Presbytery, ſucceeded *Timothy* and *Titus* in theſe Offices. Firſt, it is granted by our late Engliſh Presbyterians, and alſo, long ſince, by *Chamier*, and other Presbyterians abroad: that about, *A. D.* 140. there were ſingle perſons, in every Church, ſet over all the reſt of the Presbyters, which had the chief government of the Church, all the World over. §. 75. *n.* 1.

*3. Found before the middle of the 2d. Age in the poſſeſſion of ſingle Perſons, ſuperior to Presbyters.

▵ [See *Jus divin. Miniſt. Anglic.* written by the Presbyterian Aſſembly, *A. D.* 1654. p. 104. Queſt. *How long was it, that the Church of Chriſt was governed by the Common-Council of Presbyters without a Biſhop ſet over them?* Anſw. Dr. *Blondel, a man of great reading and learning, undertakes in a large diſcourſe to make out, that, before the year* 140. *there was not a Biſhop over Presbyters.* But you muſt know that *Blondel* ſaid this, upon denying *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, as lately publiſhed according to ſome ancient Copies by *Iſaac Voſſius*, and Biſhop *Uſher*, to be genuine, of which we have ſpoken before §. 44. Which Epiſtles, if they ſtand good, do manifeſtly ſhew, that there were Biſhops in the Churches, having authority over Presbyters within eight or nine years of the death of the laſt of the Apoſtles. —Again, ▵ See the Presbyterians firſt anſwer to the King in the Iſle of *Wight*, *Oct.* 3. p. 11. where they have theſe words; *We grant, that not long after the Apoſtle's times, Biſhops, in ſome Superiority to Presbyters, are, by the Writers of thoſe times, reported to be in the Church.* §. 75. *n.* 2.

▵ See likewiſe *Chamier*‖, who, in returning an anſwer to the Authorities urged by *Bellarmine* out of ſome ancient Fathers, and namely one out of S. *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles; * who was Biſhop of *Antioch* at the ſame time, §. 75. *n.* 3.

‖ *De Oecumen. Pontif. l.* 10. *c.* 6. *Sect.* 23, 24.

'time, when S. *John* writ our Saviour's Epiſtle to the 'Angels of the ſeven *Aſian* Churches; and * who 'within nine years after S. *John*'s death ſuffered Mar-'tyrdom in the eleventh year of *Trajan*; *Chamier*, I ſay, 'in returning an anſwer to theſe, yields thus much.— '*Horum authoritates oſtendunt inæqualitatem* [Epiſcopo-'rum & Presbyterorum] *eſſe vetuſtiſſimam, ac vicinam* 'Apoſtolorum temporibus. *Quod nos ultrò fatemur, nam* 'Hieronymus, *cùm docet eam inæqualitatem invaluiſſe* 'apud Alexandrinos *temporibus* Heraclæ & Dionyſii, 'ſatis diſertè docet, antiquiſſimam eam fuiſſe. *Nam ii* 'vixerunt circa annum 140. & *quod excurrit:* [theſe 'lived about 240. but his following inſtance in *Ignatius* 'puts this buſineſs high enough], & *tamen ſic deſignatur* 'Eccleſia, *quæ omnium poſtrema eam innovationem admi-*'ſerit: *quam* [innovationem] *propterea conjicere licet* 'factam, *aut nondum elapſo, aut vix elapſo primo ſæculo.* 'At Ignatius *pervenit uſque ad finem primi ſæculi, occiſus* 'anno Trajani *undecimo, juxta* Baronium. Now one 'of the Apoſtles, S. *John*, outlived the firſt age, dying 'at *Epheſus A. D.* 101. ——

§.75.n.4. '△ See D. *Blondel Apol. pro ſentent. Hieron.* p. 3. where 'he conjectures the *decretum totius orbis, ut unus electus* 'ſuperponeretur cæteris, *ad quem omnis Eccleſiæ cura perti-*'neret, &c, mentioned by S. *Hierom*, (cited here below '§. 76. *n.* 2.) not to have been long before *A. D.* '140.— Hieronymus *ſcripſit: toto orbe decretum eſt, &c,* 'poſtquam alii paſſim, Corinthiorum *more, dementati,* 'in partes diſcerpti ſunt: *Quod* (ſaith he) *ante A. D.* '140. eveniſſe *idoneè vix quiſquam probaverit*; and ſee 'below (§. 79.) more out of him to the ſame pur-'poſe.——

§.75.n.5. '△ See likewiſe *Salmaſius* (who writ on this ſubject 'before *Blondel*, and whoſe ſteps *Blondel* moſt-what 'treads in) in his Book called *Walo Meſſalinus* cap. 4. 'p. 253. —*Circa initium aut medium ſecundi ſæculi pri-*'mus ſingularis Epiſcopatus ſupra Presbyteratum introductus 'fuit. —And cap. 1. p. 7. He grants further,—*Rem*

eſſe

eſſe antiquiſſimam, ut duo hi Ordines in Eccleſiâ fuerint diſtincti, Epiſcoporum & Presbyterorum; ſi excipiantur Apoſtolica tempora. Quorum ævo, ut eorum ſcripta teſtantur, nullam conſtat eorum Ordinum fuiſſe diſtinctionem.

[Where obſerve; that there are only the Apoſtle's Writings left to defend the equality or identity of thoſe two Orders. And then; when there is controverſie concerning the ſenſe of thoſe Writings of the Apoſtles, what better Interpreter have we thereof, than the practice of the Church in the next time to the Apoſtle's, which practice is yielded here to be on the Biſhop's ſide.] —

△ Laſtly ſee *Du Moulin* (cited below §. 79.) who affirms — *Ordinem Epiſcopalem eſſe juris Apoſtolici.* — & — *quomodocunque appellaverimus* Titum, Timotheum, &c, *ſive Epiſcopos, ſive Evangeliſtas, conſtare, eos habuiſſe ſucceſſores Epiſcopos, hæredes illius præeminentiæ.*] §. 75. n. 6.

2ly. It is granted by *Chamier*, *Peter du Moulin* and others, that immediately after, and alſo in, the Apoſtle's times, there was a *primus Presbyter*; who, to avoid confuſion ariſing from equality, had ſome preheminency, yea and alſo *ſome* authority and juriſdiction above the reſt. Of which thus *Chamier*‖, — *Deinceps è cœtu Presbyterorum, qui ſic in commune Eccleſiam adminiſtrabant, unus electus, qui omnium primus eſſet, & Epiſcopus diceretur. Factæ mutationis teſtes locupletiſſimi* Ambroſius & Hieronymus. Then, producing the place out of S. *Ambroſe* [or indeed *Hilary*] he thus goes on. — *Ille, in* Epheſ. 4. 11. — *Non per omnia conveniunt ſcripta Apoſtoli Ordinationi, quæ nunc in Eccleſiâ eſt; quia hæc* [Eph. 4. 11.] *inter ipſa primordia ſunt ſcripta: Nam &* Timotheum, *Presbyterum à ſe creatum, Epiſcopum vocat; quia primi Presbyteri* [as *Timothy* was, ſee the ſame Author in 1 *Tim.* 3. — Hic Epiſcopus eſt, qui inter Presbyteros primus eſt. *Timotheum* Presbyterum Ordinatum ſignificat Apoſtolus; ſed, quia ante ſe alterum non habebat, Epiſcopus erat.] *Epiſcopi appellabantur*; §. 76. n. 1.

4. A prime Presbyter, having a Preſidency over the reſt found in the Apoſtle's times, and thoſe immediately following.

‖ *De Oecum. Pontif. l.* 10. *c.* 5. *Sect.* 5.

bantur; *ut*, *recedente eo*, *sequens* [he that was in order the next Presbyter to him] *succederet* [*i. e.* esset Episcopus, *or* primus Presbyter]. *Denique apud* Ægyptum *Presbyteri consignant*, *si præsens non sit Episcopus. Sed*, *quia cœperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos*, *immutata est ratio*, *prospiciente Concilio*; *ut non ordo*, *sed meritum crearet Episcopum*, *multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum*, *ne indignus temerè usurparet*, *& esset multis scandalum.* [Here you see *Timothy*, within the Apostle's times, confessed by *Chamier*, urging *Ambrose* for it, to be *primus Presbyter*, and *Episcopus*: and that all the change, which this Author mentions to have been introduced by later times, was not any addition of more authority to this *primus Presbyter*, (and you may see before §. 73. what authority *Timothy* is confessed to have by the Presbyterians), but a new way of election of this *primus Presbyter*; *viz.* not of the Senior Presbyter, as formerly; but of the more deserving.] ——

§. 76. n. 2. Next followeth in *Chamier* the Testimony of S. *Hierome* (of which see more below §. 131.) in *Tit.* 1. cap. 5, 6, 7. verses, from which the Father collects. —— *Idem est ergò Presbyter qui & Episcopus. Et*, *antequam*, *Diaboli instinctu*, *studia in religione fierent*, *& diceretur in populis*: *Ego sum* Pauli, *ego* Apollo, *ego verò* Cephæ, *communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Postquam verò unusquisque eos*, *quos baptizaverat*, *suos putabat esse*, *non Christi*, *in toto orbe decretum est*, *ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris*, *ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret*, *& schismatum semina tollerentur.* —— *Rursùs*: *Idem* Hieron. Ep. 85. *ad* Evagrium. *Manifestissimè comprobatur eundem esse Episcopum & Presbyterum* [*i. e.* at the first]. —— *Quòd autem postea unus electus est*, *qui cæteris præponeretur*, *in schismatis remedium factum est*, *ne unusquisque*, *ad se trahens Christi Ecclesiam*, *rumperet. Nam &* Alexandriæ *à* Marco *Evangelistâ*, *usque ad* Heraclem *& Dionysium Episcopos*, *Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum*, *in excelsiori*

excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant. Quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocent. [Where, if the latter *simile* seem somewhat low, the former is high enough]. *Quid enim facit, exceptâ ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?* [Here again, out of this Father's Testimony, it is clear, 1. * that St. *Mark* the Evangelist was set over the Church of *Alexandria*, as *Timothy* over *Ephesus*. And 2. * that, he dying (which was in the eighth year of *Nero*, before both S. *Peter*'s, and St. *Paul*'s death); another Presbyter was chosen by the rest (*Eusebius* ‖ saith, his name was *Anianus*), and in *excelsiori gradu collocatus, ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret*; 3. and this *in schismatis remedium, & ut schismatum semina tollerentur*; 4. This therefore must be with a supereminent Power and Authority over the rest, as *cura* implies; and *schismatis remedium* requires; 5. And this clearly in the Apostle's times. Here then is a single Person, and not the whole Presbytery, succeeding in that Office, which *Mark* and *Timothy* had, *i. e.* of Ordaining, and imposing Censures: and so the question decided in *Mark*, which is made concerning *Timothy*; *viz.* Whether *Timothy* was not, in his Office, an extraordinary Person? and whether it was, after his decease, devolved on another single Person, as the former Church hath delivered; or on the whole Presbytery, as that Party contends? The governing therefore of the Churches *communi Presbyterorum consilio* (as this Father will have it) must be before this; which Government better fitted the first beginnings of the Church, but, when it, and its Rectors were a little multiplied, it seems, was not found the best way for preventing Schisms.]

‖ *Hist. l. 2. c. 21.*

Again the same *Chamier* (*ibid.* §. 17.) to *Bellarmine* urging another place of S. *Hierome de scriptor. Eccles.* — §. 7 6. n. 3.

[Jacobus *ab Apostolis, statim post ascensionem domini*, Hierosolymorum *Episcopus ordinatus, suscepit Ecclesiam* Hiero-

Hierosolymæ; Timotheus *à* Paulo Ephesiorum *Episcopus Ordinatus*; Titus Cretæ; Polycarpus *à* Johanne Smyrnæ *Episcopus Ordinatus*] answereth thus. *Respondeo Episcopum appellari primum Presbyterum, eoque munere* Jacobum *functum*, i. e. *ei primo omnium* [Presbyterorum] *demandatam ejus Ecclesiæ curam; itaque verè fuisse primum Presbyterum, adeoque Episcopum.* [Here therefore are confessed *primi Presbyteri*, or *primi Presbyterorum* in the Apostle's times; who were endued with the same superior Authority to other Presbyters as *Timothy* and *Titus* had; and who also might have their single Successors, in this place of *primus Presbyter*. What can be more desired?] Lastly, to shew you, that the same *Chamier* alloweth this *primus Presbyter* to have not only a Title or Place, but also Authority, over the rest; to *Bellarmine* urging out of *Ambrose*, that he, that was chosen *primus Presbyter*, had *novam potestatem & jurisdictionem*, he answers (ibid. §. 10.) ——*Accipere tamen* novam potestatem Jurisdictionemque *non iverim inficias, ut ne esset Episcopatus merus titulus. Ac sanè, cùm quis esset tantùm Presbyter, non fit verisimile, ullam habuisse in suos collegas, aut in universam Ecclesiam, jurisdictionem; sed tantùm cum fiebat primus,* i. e. *Episcopus.* Thus much out of *Chamier.*

§. 77. Before whom; *Bucer* ‖ had acknowledged much-what the same: *viz. That the Episcopal Office indeed was imposed upon all the Presbyters; yet so notwithstanding, that alwaies, even in the times of the Apostles themselves, one of the Presbyters was chosen, and ordained to be a guide of this* [Episcopal] *Office, and (as it were) a Prelate, who went before all the rest, and had the care of Souls, and administred the Episcopal Office, chiefly and in the highest degree.* Thus *Bucer* ——And with *Bucer Calvin* also, commenting on *Tit.* 1. 5. seems thus far to accord (which he saith may be learned out of that Text) ——*Non eam fuisse tunc æqualitatem inter Ecclesiæ ministros, quin unus aliquis authoritate & consilio præesset.* Now if we ask *Bucer*, what *Administration*, and *Calvin* what *Authority*,

‖ *Lib. de Animar. cura inter scripta Angli.* p. 380.

rity, this was, that this one Perſon had; muſt they not ſay: that Adminiſtration and Authority, that *Timothy* and *Titus* had (for they ſpeak of theſe)? and, then; if we ask the Engliſh Presbyterians, what Authority *Timothy* and *Titus* had? they ſay; the ſame Authority that modern Epiſcopacy claimeth: *viz.* ordaining and inflicting cenſures with ſome majority of Power, in theſe, *non*-competent to other Presbyters, wherein they ſtile them Officers extraordinary: (ſee before §. 73.). And this brings to mind, * what *Maſon*, not able otherwiſe to make a thorough-Apology for the *Geneva*-Government, ſaith of the Authority that *Calvin* and *Beza* exerciſed in their Church (*Def.* of *Ordin.* p. 175.) —That, *they being choſen to a place of eminency and indued with Juriſdiction, they having preheminence* [as he ſaith before] *in every action, and conſequently in Ordination, none can with reaſon deny them the ſubſtance of the Epiſcopal Office* [*i. e.* in reſpect of the other Clergy of *Geneva*]. ——And * what, before him, Biſhop *Andrews* ſaith, in the ſame way of Apologizing for the tranſmarine Churches. —— *Quid attinet abolere nomen, retinere rem? Nam & vos rem retinetis ſine titulo: & illorum uterque, quos nominabas* [i. e. *Beza* and *Calvinus*] *dum vixerunt, quid erant, niſi, abolito nomine, reipsâ Epiſcopi?*

* *Reſp.* 3. *ad* Molin.

§. 78.

Again concerning the ſame matter, *Peter du Moulin* ‖ (who hath written a large Treatiſe on this ſubject) confeſſeth thus much. —— *Statim poſt tempora Apoſtolorum, aut etiam eorum tempore, ut teſtatur Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica, conſtitutum eſſe; ut in unâ urbe unus inter cæteros Presbyteros Epiſcopus vocaretur, qui in ſuos Collegas haberet præeminentiam, ad vitandam confuſionem, quæ ſæpè ex æqualitate naſcitur. Et hanc quidem regiminis formam omnes ubique Eccleſias recepiſſe.* Thus he (as Biſhop *Andrews* noteth upon it) ſomewhat faintly, and dilutely; in his ſaying [* *aut etiam*], and not [* *&*] which the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory clearly affirms; —[* *ut vocaretur*], and not [* *ut eſſet*]; —[* *haberet præeminentiam*], and not

‖ *De Munere Paſtorali*, and in his three Letters to Biſhop *Andrews*.

not [*poteſtatem*]; —[*ad vitandam* * *confuſionem*], which is oppoſed only to Order; and not [* *Schiſma*] oppoſed to unity. But though ſuch were *Moulin*'s cautious words in his *Munus Paſtorale*; yet after that the Biſhop had agitated the matter with him, and much preſſed, out of the Ancient Church-Hiſtory and Fathers, that *James*, *Mark*, *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Clemens*, *Polycarpus*, *Ignatius*, were made Biſhops in the Apoſtle's times, by the Apoſtles themſelves, ſome of them unqueſtionably with a ſuperior Authority to other Presbyters; in which Authority, alſo, ſingle Perſons ſucceeded them, (You may ſee Biſhop *Andrew*'s proofs thereof, if you pleaſe, in *Reſp. ad* Ep. 1. *Molinei* p. 170.), *Du Moulin*, in his Ep. 3. to the Biſhop, yieldeth (ſee p. 181, 182.) —*that the Biſhop had urged *doctè omnia, & ex veteris hiſtoriæ fide*; —— * that *Ordo Epiſcopalis* was *Juris Apoſtolici* —— and * that, *quomodocunque appellaverimus* Titum, Timotheum, & Marcum, *ſeu Epiſcopos, ſeu Evangeliſtas, conſtare, eos habuiſſe ſucceſſores Epiſcopos, hæredes illius præeminentiæ*: and then flyeth to this anſwer; that this propoſition. *Omnia quæ ſunt juris Apoſtolici, eſſe etiam divini, ſibi videtur pati aliquas exceptiones. Multa eſſe ſtatuta ab Apoſtolis circa politiam Eccleſiaſticam, quæ non ſunt juris divini. —— Quæ ad ſalutem & fidem pertinent, ab Apoſtolis ſtatuta eſſe afflatu divino; in cæteris nſos ſæpè eſſe ſuâ prudentiâ: ut innuit* Paulus 1 *Cor.* 7. 25. And then, by making Biſhops, thus only, *Apoſtolici juris*, or rather, *Apoſtolicæ prudentiæ*, *pro tempore*, he prepareth his way for the lawfulneſs of abrogating, and changing ſuch Government, as each Church's Affairs ſhall require: as (ſaith he Ep. 3.) *mos creandi Diaconiſſas* 1 Tim. 5. *pridem exolevit, —— & præceptum Apoſtolorum, de abſtinentiâ à ſanguine & ſuffocatis.* To whom Biſhop *Andrews* (p. 193.) returns this: (after having ſhewed; that there was no Precept paſſed obliging the Church to have Deaconeſſes; and that the other Precept, concerning abſtinence from Blood had reſpect to the Jewiſh Synagogue; which defunct, this

this Injunction is underſtood by the whole Church to have expired alſo.). He returns (I ſay) this admonition,——* *periculosè vel dici, vel ſcribi, Apoſtolos, in quibuſdam afflatu divino, in reliquis, ſuâ prudentiâ, ſæpè uſos; idque in iis, quæ ſcripta reperiuntur.*——And —— * *locos, non afflatu divino ſed humanâ prudentiâ ſcriptos* [as that 1 *Cor.* 7. 25.] *notandos* [eſſe] *nobis pro Apocryphis*, &c. Yet——* *in jure, & more Apoſtelorum ſatis eſſe ponderis ad cauſæ hujus arcem ſtatuendam.* Thus Biſhop *Andrews*. [But if Epiſcopacy (I mean as denoting a ſuperior authority to other Presbyters) was by the Apoſtle's prudence eſtabliſhed, as moſt ſutable to their times, and by the following ages likewiſe for 1500. years, retained, as no leſs ſuitable to their's, what difference herein have the preſent times from all the former, that, after ſo long a preſcription, now produceth the neceſſity of a change? or at leaſt, why will the Presbyterians out of the ſame Apoſtle's writings, who did ſet it up, endeavour to confute it?] However: thus much we have allowed from *Du Moulin* and *Chamier*.

If you have a Curioſity to know alſo, how far *Blondel* a great Patron of Presbyters, condeſcends in this matter. He, in his *Apolog. pro ſentent. Hieron.* (p. 52.), Comments thus upon the ſaying of S. *Ambroſe* (or, as he ſaith, of one *Hilary* contemporary with S. *Ambroſe*) cited before § 76. *n.* 1. *Ubicunque primùm, naſcente Chriſtianiſmo, Presbyterorum Collegium aggregari cœpit, antiquiſſimo inter collegas Primatus contigit; ut conſeſſus totius Caput fratrumque tandem* πρωτοκαθεδρίας *jure quodam* πρωτοτοκίας, *fieret.* [To which I muſt add, though he taketh no notice of it, that this πρωτοκαθεδρίας continued ſo for term of life, none ſucceeding in his place, before his death, a thing undeniable in Antiquity.] —— *Cui* (p. 53.) *primas ubique partes deferebant; ut, ſi quando novus co-optandus eſſet Collega Cleri plebiſque ſuffragiis comprobatus, totius Presbyterii* χειροθεσία, *in poſſeſſionem muneris mitteretur; præeunte* § 79. *n.* 1.

tamen, ac, reliquorum nomine, solennia benedictionum verba pronunciante, promotione-antiquissimo. [He therefore the chief Ordainer]. Afterward (Ibid.)——*Hanc Ecclesiasticæ politiæ formam, ego sanè libere, ab initio observatam, Christianisque traditam, sive ab Apostolis, sive ab eorum Discipulis, crediderim, sed ut mutabilem, & pro usu ac arbitrio Ecclesiæ, mutandam.*——After he saith; that, *Tituli Episcopalis, in gratiam primi Presbyteri, reservatio sensim facta est.* And ‖ that [out of ambition of this place] τῶν φιλοπρωτευόντων Antesignanus Diotrephes (*paulo ante A. D.* 100.), *& fratres Ecclesiâ pellere, & adversus Apostolum* Johannem *nefariis sermonibus blaterare, ausus est.*——Thebuthis, ‖ *post* Simeonis [Bishop of *Jerusalem*] *crucifixi triumphum* (*A. D.* 107.) *se non factum Episcopum indignatus*, Hierosolymitanam *Ecclesiam eousque virginem, per septem* Judaicas *hæreses, clam devirginare statuit.* [The same he acknowledgeth of *Valentinus, Marcion*, and *Montanus* (about *A. D.* 140.) becoming ring-leaders of Hereticks, because they missed Bishopricks]: which instances (by his leave) shew plainly, that Bishopricks went not, then, by Seniority of the Presbyters, but by election and suffrages, nor had a bare Presidency, void of power. But also elsewhere (*Apol. p.* 39.), upon *Tertullian*'s calling the Presbyters *Præsidentes*, *Blondel* argueth them endued with authority, in respect of them, over whom they preside.——*Quis enim* (saith he) *præsidentiam sine authoritate somniet; cùm præsidentiam ab ipsâ regendi authoritate nullatenus differre noverint, qui nondum are lavantur?* [What he therefore saith of the Presidency of Presbyters I apply to that of the prime Presbyters, *non præsidebant sine authoritate regendi.*]——Again, in his preface (p. 6.) he saith, ——*Ad hos Presbyteriorum præpositos confluebat, ex communi Collegarum consensu, Ecclesiæ cujusque cura.*——*Et iis, ceu* ἐξάρχοις, *commissi gregis tam* κατορθώματα *quàm pudenda, ex æquo & imputari potuere, & à Domino ipso, Ecclesiarum* Asiaticarum *Angelos armante cœlestibus monitis ad*

‖ p. 54.

‖ *Euseb. Hist. l.* 4. *c.* 22.

ad fidei conſtantiam, imputata ſunt. [Here he makes the ſeven Angels of thoſe Churches to be *Presbyteriorum præpoſitos* and ἐξάρχους.]——And elſewhere (*Apol. p.* 35.) He ſaith;——*non nego Collegii cujuſque* [Presbyterorum] *caput, non modò collegarum, ſed Eccleſiæ, imò Eccleſiarum, ruralium ſcilicet & vicinarum, Præſidem fuiſſe.*——Laſtly, (in *præfat. p.* 7, 11, 31.) he ſaith;——that this *prima, in Presbyteriis, cathedra ac poteſtatis jus* ceaſed to be *penes Seniores Presbyteros*; and that——*alio Ordine, ac providentiâ, Eccleſia gubernari cœpit* about *A. D.* 136, or 140: at which time *Hyginus* Biſhop of *Rome* ‖ is ſaid *compoſuiſſe clerum, &, diſtribuiſſe gradus,*——and at which time (*Apol p.* 3.) he conjectures *S. Hierome* to have pointed, when he ſaid——*Toto orbe decretum eſt, ut unus electus ſuperponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Eccleſia cura pertineret, &c.* (as it is cited before §. 76. *n.* 2.) Hieronymus *ſcripſit toto orbe decretum, &c. poſtquam alii paſſim* Corinthiorum *more, dementati, in partes diſcerpti ſunt, quod ante annum* 140. *eveniſſe idonee vix quiſquam probaverit.* Now, upon this preeminency of one above the reſt, I find him elſewhere facile to grant a priviledge of *Ordaining* alſo belonging to the ſo advanced, (ſee p. 157.)——*Nemo verò* (ſaith he) *jure negaverit, ex quo quædam Epiſcopis illis aſſignata eſt ſuper conſortes* ὑπεροχὴ, *neceſſe fuiſſe, ut clericorum quorumcunque conſecrationibus præeſſent; ex eorundemque claſſe prodirent, qui evectos ad Epiſcopatus, Presbyteriique gradus, in demandati muneris poſſeſſionem, totius Eccleſiæ nomine, mitterent. Electos igitur, conſuetâ manus impoſitione, myſticâque prece, conſecrare* ſoli [Epiſcopi] debuerunt, *non alii* [Presbyteri], *quos, ſecundas in Eccleſiaſtico Miniſterio partes obire, conſuetudo voluerat.* [Here, *Blondel* yields, Ordination moſt properly to belong to thoſe, who have the ὑπεροχὴ amongſt the Clergy. And indeed ſuppoſing the Biſhops or the prime Presbyters, whether by Apoſtolical, or by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, *ad tollenda ſchiſmata*, ſet above the Presbytery, what leſſer power can be given them, than that μηδὲν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου (as S. *Ignatius* in-

‖ V. *Pontific. Damaſ.*

joins) that nothing be done by the Presbyters without them? and, if *nothing*; then, especially, not these two; not sacred Orders conferred, nor Church-censures inflicted without them]. —

§. 79. *n.* 2. This concerning the Concessions of D. *Blondel.* Touching which, before I proceed, I cannot but observe

1. these three things to you. 1. That he, grounding the ancient government of the prime or senior Presbyter on that place of *Ambrose* or *Hilary* before cited, §. 76. *n.* 1. (the only Author in all Antiquity that is produced for any such thing) must, according to the same place, grant *Timothy* to have been a *primus Presbyter*; and so, the prime Presbyter (*Timothy* and his Successors) to have the power of ordaining, and exercising censures; which yields the whole cause: but he, well seeing this, accords not with *Hilary* herein, but (in *præfat. p.* 7.) will have *Timothy* and *Titus* to be persons

2. extraordinary, *Apostolos adlectos.* 2^ly. That (according to this Author) he must hold; that these prime Presbyters, called also Bishops, could be ordained only by other prime Presbyters, or Bishops: for so this Author (in 1 *Timoth.* 3.) —*Post Episcopum Diaconatus Ordinationem subjicit. Quare? nisi quia Episcopi & Presbyteri una Ordinatio est. Uterque enim Sacerdos est. Sed Episcopus primus est; ut omnis Episcopus Presbyter sit, non tamen omnis Presbyter Episcopus. Hic enim Episcopus est, qui inter Presbyteros primus est. Denique* Timotheum *Presbyterum ordinatum significat; sed, quia alterum ante se non habebat, Episcopus erat. Unde & ostendit quemadmodum* Episcopum [*i. e.* primum inter Presbyteros] ordinet. *Neque enim fas erat, aut licebat, ut inferior* [*Timotheus* if non-Episcopus, or, non-primus-Presbyter] *ordinaret majorem* [Episcopum *or* primum Presbyterum]. *Nemo enim tribuit, quod non accepit.* This Author, then, understandeth by *Episcopus*, in *Timothy*, not every common Presbyter, but the superior of them; and plainly saith; that though *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* are both one, and have the same ordination, i. e. *quoad Sacerdotium*;

yet

yet they are not both one, *quoad dignitatem* or *primatum*: becauſe *Epiſcopus* is *primus*; and therefore no ordinary, or ſecond Presbyter can ordain the prime Presbyter, or Biſhop: for ſo *inferior ordinaret majorem.* But *Blondel* (p. 310.), contrary to *Hilary*, holds; that Presbyters did ordain theſe prime Presbyters or Biſhops, from that place of S. *Hierome* cited before §. 76. *n.* 2. which place indeed imports their election of the Biſhop, but not neceſſarily therefore their Ordination of him: and, that S. *Hierome* held, that there was even in thoſe firſt times a diſtinct Ordination of Biſhops, ſee the place cited before §. 76. *n.* 3. 3ly. That his conjecture, that S. *Hierome*'s election of a Superior, for preventing ſchiſmes, *ad quem omnis Eccleſiæ cura pertineret*, began not, till about *A.* 140. ſeemeth to be contradicted by the very next words in this Father ‖, which affirm, ſuch Election to have been in *Egypt* ever from S. *Mark*'s time; and ſeemeth alſo to be contradicted elſewhere by *Blondel* himſelf, who (in *præfat.* p. 33. and again p. 38.) ſpeaketh, as if he acknowledged no more authority in theſe *elects*, than was formerly in the *Seniors*: or, if more, yet not ſo much authority as to amount, *to — *ad quos omnis Eccleſiæ cura pertinebat*; or * to ſuch a remedy of ſchiſme *ut nihil, ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, aggrederentur cæteri Presbyteri* — (ſee his *præfat.* p. 39.); Or, * to that which the ſame Father ſaith elſewhere ‖ alſo. — *Eccleſiæ ſalutem in ſummi ſacerdotis dignitate pendere; cui ſi non exors quædam, & ab omnibus eminens detur poteſtas, tot in Eccleſiis efficientur ſchiſmata, quot ſacerdotes.* Thus much concerning *Blondel.* 3.

‖ See before Sect. 76.

‖ Ad Luciferian.

In the laſt place, our Engliſh Presbyterians (ſee their anſwer to the King *Octob.* 17. *p.* 35.) do grant; * *That there were immediately after the Apoſtles times, ſome eminent perſons, that preſided in the Presbyteries of the Cities, or the Churches; which perſons were called Biſhops by ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Writers, as wrote after the diviſion or diſtinction of the names of Presbyters and Biſhops, — and* [*in* Jus Divin. Miniſt. Angli. p. 119.]: * *That there was a* primus Presbyter, §. 80.

Their Assertion.

Presbyter, *or* Episcopus præses, *that* (*as a Moderator in a Church-assembly, or a speaker in a Parliament*), *governed* communi concilio Presbyterorum.

§. 81.

A prime Presbyter, or Bishop denied to have had any singular power of Ordination, exercising censures, &c. before *A. D.* 140.

But, having thus yielded such prime or senior Presbyter presiding, yet this our English Presbyterians resolutely deny; that these *first, and ancientest*, Presbyters or Presidents of the Presbyteries [i. e. before *A. D.* 140.] *were invested with power over Presbyters, and people, to whom* [as distinct from Presbyters] *did belong the power of Ordaining, or exercising censures; which, they there say, can never be proved by authentick, or competent testimonies. So that those, who are found* seriatim *in the succession of Bishops of the primitive times, are either more than Bishops, as Apostles, and extraordinary persons,* [*as* James, Timothy, Titus, Mark,], *or less than Bishops; as meerly first Presbyters, who had none of the essentials of* [modern] *Episcopal government in their hands.*

CHAP. II.

§. 82.

Their Arguments out of the *Scriptures*.

AND, what is said, they endeavour to prove by several arguments, and testimonies, both out of *Scriptures*; and *Fathers*. Of which if you would more particularly inform your self, You may peruse *Smectymnuus*, and the Assembly's *Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani*, 1654.——and their several papers in the Isle of *Wight*, 1648.—and *Blondel's Apologia pro sententiâ Hieronymi*, on whose skill in Antiquity they much depend. I shall only set down what seemeth to me, out of them, the most considerable.

1. —— *a.* —— That (there) Bishop and Presbyter signifie the same.

1. First then, out of the *Scriptures*, they prove, that the names of Bishop, and Presbyter or Elder, there, do denote only one and the same Office in the Church; namely, that of Presbyters: neither is there any other word used in Scripture (for, if there were, the Presbyter's vindicating the word [*Bishop*] to themselves would no way advantage their cause)

to

to denote any ſtanding Eccleſiaſtical office, left by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, ſuperior to Presbyters.

For theſe things; ε they cite: *Tit.* 1. 5, 7. Where the Apoſtle leaveth *Titus* in *Creet* to ordain Presbyters in every City; and then, ſhewing, how theſe *Presbyters* are to be qualified, adds; for *a Biſhop muſt be blameleſs*, &c. §. 83. *n.* 1. ε.

ϛ They cite *Act.* 20, 17, 28, 38. Where S. *Paul* from *Miletum* ſends for the Presbyters of *Epheſus*: and being never to ſee them more, ſpeaks thus unto them. *Take heed to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you* [ἐπισκόπους] *Biſhops* [ποιμαίνειν] *to feed* [by Government and by doctrine] *the Church of God*; and this he doth, without referring them to any Superior, or giving *Timothy* any part of the charge; though, probably, he then preſent: For we find *Timothy* mentioned to be one of S. *Paul*'s companions from *Greece* into *Aſia*; and to be with him at *Troas*, where they took ſhip for *Miletus*, See *Act.* 20. 4, 5. As for the Commiſſion, which the Apoſtle had given to *Timothy*, concerning the governing of the Church of *Epheſus*; it was not after, but before, this meeting and commiſſion, which he gave to the Presbyters; and therefore that of no force to null this: The firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* (in which it is contained) being written by S. *Paul*, before *Timothy* came to him into *Macedonia* (ſee 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. compared with 2 *Cor.* 1, 1.); and written, when S. *Paul* had ſome purpoſe of returning to *Epheſus* again (ſee 1 *Tim.* 3. 14.); and therefore, before this meeting at *Miletus*; when he had both quitted *Macedonia*; and ſaid, that he ſhould ſee *Epheſus* no more. §. 83. *n.* 2. ϛ.

ζ. 1. They cite △ 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2. Where another Apoſtle (now very ancient) giveth a like charge, concerning the Church, to the Presbyters, without naming any other ſuperior Church-Officer——*The Presbyters which are among you I exhort, who am alſo a Presbyter*, [uſing this as an high Title of honour; as alſo S. *John* doth, in §. 83. *n.* 3. ζ. 1.

in his ſecond and third Epiſtles, verſe 1.] *feed the flock of God that is among you,* ἐπισκοποῦντες, *doing the Office of Biſhops* [δ2. whence they argue (*Jus divin.* p. 52.) that δ2. the Elders are commanded to perform all thoſe Offices in the Church, which belong to a Biſhop, and therefore to ordain and govern, *&c.* It follows; yet] *not as being Lords* [or lording it] *over God's Heritage.* [Which laſt caution argueth, ſay they, that he writ to the ſupreme Rulers thereof.] — ε. The like is ſaid in 1 *Tim.* ε. 5. 17. where the προεσβύτεροι are ſtiled προεστῶτες; the Elders that rule. ζ1. And, △ thoſe ſpeeches in the plural ζ1. number concerning ruling, * of the Apoſtle (1 *Cor.* 5.) *Do not ye judge them that are within? — and put ye away from among your ſelves that wicked perſon* ζ2. And * of our ζ2. Saviour (*Mat.* 18.) *Tell the Church:* (*which cannot be underſtood of one, but many.*) η1. And, △ thoſe *Rev.* 2. η1. verſe 24. *Unto you I ſay, and to the reſt,* — and (verſe 10.) *Behold the Devil ſhall caſt ſome of you into priſon.* Theſe Texts in the plural, implying Juriſdiction *in foro externo*, (they ſay) cannot be underſtood of a Biſhop, becauſe a ſingle perſon: Nor of the whole Congregation promiſcuouſly, becauſe the people are no Church-rulers and Judges: therefore theſe Texts muſt be underſtood of the Presbytery; and do ſhew, that the key of Juriſdiction and Diſcipline, as well as of Doctrine, doth belong to them; and thoſe words, in *Rev.* 2. 10. 24. do ſhew the word *Angel*, in *Rev.* 1. 20. (ſo much made uſe of) to be a complexe as well, as *Candleſtick* is; many Rulers being ſignified by the one, as η2. people by the other. — η2 Again they cite, as theſe Texts, to prove *Juriſdiction* belonging to Presbyters; ſo, that Text, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14 to ſhew *Ordination* belonging to them. — *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.*

§. 83. *n.* 4. θ. They cite *Phil.* 1, 1. * Where, firſt, are only mentioned two Orders of Church-men, Biſhops and Deacons; not, three; and where the Presbyters are quite omitted

omitted, if not involv'd in the word Biſhops: But 2ly. * Where by Biſhops muſt be meant Presbyters; becauſe of ſuch Biſhops, as are ſuperior to Presbyters, the Prelatical Party grants, there could not be many in one City, and why was *Timothy* intended to be ſent to this Church from *Rome* (*Phil.* 2. 19. &c.) if there was, here, already a Biſhop eſtabliſhed? 3ly. Where no Perſon, ſuperior to theſe Biſhops, being ſaluted by the Apoſtle's Epiſtle, it argues, that there was none ſuch eſtabliſhed at *Philippi* at all, but that the Government was finally left in the Presbyter's hands; becauſe this Epiſtle was written by S. *Paul*, after the Eaſtern Churches were ſettled, from *Rome*; probably not long before his end. 2. 3.

They cite x1. likewiſe, in 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 8. the deſcription of the duty only of two Church-Officers: Biſhops and Deacons; (whereas the Prelatical Party will have *Timothy* the Ordainer of three; namely of Prelatical Biſhops, of Presbyters, and of Deacons); and theſe Biſhops in 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. doubtleſs the ſame with thoſe in *Titus* 1. 7. much-what the ſame things being ſaid of them in both places: and then thoſe in *Titus* are Presbyters, as is clear in *Tit.* 1. 5. And again theſe Biſhop-Presbyters were ſuch, as were to rule the Church, as is clear in 1 *Tim.* 3, 4, 5. [*If a Man know not how to rule his own Houſe, how ſhall he take the care of the Church of God?*] —— Add to this; x2. that in the places, where the Holy Ghoſt doth on purpoſe ſet down all the ſeveral ſorts of Miniſtry, which Chriſt hath Ordained in his Church as, in 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. —— *Eph* 4. 11, 12. —— *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. No mention is made of a Biſhop diſtinct from, or ſuperior to, a Presbyter in the Power of Ordination, and Juriſdiction. There is mention of Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, who were extraordinary, and temporary Officers, and had no Succeſſors (properly) *in eundem gradum:* and mention of Paſtors and Teachers, who are the only ordinary, ſtanding, and perpetual Miniſters; But no mention of §. 83. n. 5. x1. x2.

the Pope, Archbiſhops, or Biſhops, diſtinct from Paſtors and Teachers, ſee *Jus divinum* part 2. p. 53.

§. 84. *n.* 1.

2.

λ.

That both ſignifie not the modern Biſhop, but Presbyter.

1.

2. λ. Theſe two names of Biſhop and Presbyter or Elder, being thus ſhewed in Scripture to denote the ſame Perſon, and Function; Next: that, by both them, is not meant the Biſhop, Prelatical, or ſuperior to ſimple Presbyters, (a way, which ſome have taken, as the ſafeſt for avoiding all the former Arguments for the Presbyterial Dignity), they thus prove: 1. Becauſe of Prelatical Biſhops there could never be ſave one only in one City (excepting perhaps in thoſe Cities, where the Chriſtian *Jew* and the Chriſtian *Gentile* kept, for a while, diſtinct Churches). But it is clear, that in one City were many of theſe Scripture-Elders or Biſhops. For there were many in *Epheſus*; whom S. *Paul*, being in a haſty Journey, ſent-for to *Miletum*: who, had they been the Prelatical Biſhops of ſeveral *Aſian* Churches, beſides, that it is *gratis* ſuppoſed, that all theſe Biſhops ſhould, then, be united in a body at *Epheſus*, eſpecially in the abſence of *Timothy* the ſuppoſed Biſhop of *Epheſus* their *Metropolitan*, the Hiſtory would have ſtiled them Elders *of the Churches*, or *of Aſia*, as they are called. *Rev.* 1. 20. (not of the Church, and of *Epheſus*. See *Act.* 20. 17. Of which Church the Chriſtians living in the adjoining parts of the *Lydian Aſia* were accounted Members; ſee *Act.* 19. 10. — 20. 18. compared with 17.): As alſo elſewhere 'tis ſaid, not Church, but *Churches* of *Judea*, *Gal.* 1. 22. Again; why ſendeth the Apoſtle to *Epheſus*, ſince the Elder of that place, who, according to this opinion, was but one, *Timothy*, was already with S. *Paul*? Many Elders or Presbyters therefore there were of *Epheſus* it ſelf, and not of *Aſia* only. And ſo we find alſo many Biſhops of *Philippi*. (*Phil.* 1. 1.) Of whom the like things may be ſaid as of thoſe of *Epheſus*; the ſuppoſed Prelatical Biſhop of *Philippi*, *Epaphroditus*, being then at *Rome* with S. *Paul*. (*Phil.* 2. 25.) ——But, ſuppoſing theſe Texts capable of ſome reply;

* what

* what can be said to *James* 5. 14. [*Is any sick among you, let him call for the Elders or Presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, &c.*], since only one Elder is supposed in that Church, where the Sick Person is; unless here also be an extraordinary meeting of Bishops? * What, said to *Act.* 11. 30. --15. 2. --18. 2. Where these Elders are still found resident at *Jerusalem*? Could all these be extraordinary Assemblies? Or were the Bishops of *Judea* ordinarily Non-resident in those Primitive times, save only *James*, the Bishop of *Jerusalem*?

2ly. By this Opinion, those, now called Presbyters, who officiate so much in the Church, who teach the People, who consecrate and dispense to them the highest Sacraments, will have no being in the Apostle's times: and are excluded from any Original, either *Juris Divini*, or *Apostolici*. When yet S. *Ignatius* chargeth the People to obey them as the Apostles (see before §. 44. *n.* 1.): Or, if they had some being then; yet are they never taken care of, or so much as saluted in the Apostle's Writings; and, when there are such punctual directions given concerning the qualification of the supremest, the Bishops; and of the lowest, order of the Clergy, the Deacons; yet is this middle one, (of much more consequence), as it were left quite out of the Apostle's sollicitude; nay, not then having so much as the name of a *Presbyter*; for this would at least have put the Apostle to a distinction, when he sent for, or spoke of, his *Presbyter-Prelates*. §. 84. *n.* 2. 2.

3ly. According to this opinion, the Authority and Commission, S. *Paul* giveth to *Timothy*, or *Titus*, over Elders or Presbyters is indeed only that of a Metropolitan over Bishops: from which it will follow; that, for any thing can be produced out of, the Epistles to *Timothy*, or *Titus*, or other Scriptures, a Bishop can either claim no Jurisdiction and pre-eminency over modern Presbyters, or cannot claim more (and that not directly, but by Analogy) than a Metropolitan can §. 84. *n.* 3. 3.

claim over a Biſhop. *Hence then, (for any thing which can be ſhewed in Scripture, or, at leaſt, in the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*) Biſhops and Presbyters are of the ſame Order and Function; for ſo Metropolitans and Biſhops are: and ought not to have any different Ordination; no more than ordinary Biſhops and Metropolitans have: and *hence alſo, if three Presbyters ordain another Presbyter without their Biſhop, at leaſt their *factum valet*: for ſo doth that of three Biſhops ordaining a Biſhop without their Metropolitan. Now, all theſe are things, which the Prelatical Party will by no means own.—[1.] Theſe two terms therefore, Elder and Biſhop, being in Scripture unſeparably linked together, and importing the ſame Perſons, ſhewed in the firſt proof: and [2.] the word Elder or Presbyter not being capable to ſignifie the modern Biſhop, ſhewed in this ſecond proof; it follows, that the word Biſhop in Scripture muſt ſignifie the Presbyters; who are ſhewed before, alſo, to have the ſupream Government of the Church committed unto them.

§. 85. *n.* 1. 3ly. *μ.* As for *Epiſcopal Authority, ſaid to be introduced before the Apoſtle's deceaſe, to preſide over the Presbyters in ſtead of Apoſtolical; and * the ſupereminent Authority, that appears committed to *Timothy* and *Titus* over Presbyters; they ſhew; that this cannot be made uſe of to ſuſtain the like to be continued afterward on Prelatical Biſhops, becauſe the Authority committed to *Timothy* and *Titus* was extraordinary, and temporary; and expiring with their Perſons: (therefore we find one of them called by the name of an *Evangeliſt*, an extraordinary Office proper to the Apoſtle's times, 2 *Tim.* 4, 5. and we may reaſonably ſuppoſe the ſame of the other. Now, that theſe Perſons were Church-Officers extraordinary, and not Succeſſive, is gathered, firſt; *ν* for that, after this Authority in *Epheſus* given to *Timothy* for the time preſent, we find the Apoſtle, when taking his laſt farewel, * to commit the Government of the Church of *Epheſus*

μ. — 3. —

That *Timothy* and *Titus* their Office was extraordinary, occaſional, unfixt.

1. *ν.* —

Epheſus wholly to the Presbyters; as hath been ſhewed before in *Acts* 20. 28.—— §. 83.: ξ And, in the latter end of his days, from *Rome*, writing to the *Philippians*, * to mention only the Presbyters and Deacons, as the Church-Governors there, *Phil.* 1. 1.—— ϖ And * to deſcribe to *Timothy*, after his Commiſſion for ordaining Clergy, only the manner of chuſing and making Presbyters and Deacons, 1 *Tim.* 3. as if the future Church were only to depend on thoſe Governours.

ξ. —— ϖ. ——

—— 2. ϱ Again, for that the exerciſe of *Timothy*'s and *Titus*'s Authority in any particular Church was only occaſional; nor more confin'd to one place, than another. Neither had they any conſtant reſidence in any certain Province; but, as *Evangeliſts*, attended on the Apoſtle's commands; and were employed for the ſettlement of many other Churches, as well, as of that of *Epheſus* and *Creet*, as appears by what is ſtoried of them. For firſt, *Timothy* was frequently removed by the Apoſtle, and diſpatched from place to place to viſit the Churches, which he had planted: of whom he ſaith, (*Phil.* 2. 20.) ——*that he had none like-minded and who did naturally take care for them.* So, when S. *Paul* went to *Athens*, he left *Timothy* with the *Beræans*. (*Act.*17.14) ——*Timothy* being come to him, after this, to *Athens*, he diſpatched him to the *Theſſalonians*, to adminiſter ſome conſolation to them in that ſad Perſecution, that was then on foot, (1 *Theſ.* 3. 12. &c.) the Apoſtle being hindered by Satan, that himſelf could not reviſit them. (1 *Theſ.* 2. 18.) —*Timothy* returned from thence (if the firſt Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians* bear date from *Athens*) he is ſent away again from *Athens* into *Macedonia*: and thence returned to S. *Paul* to *Corinth*, (*Act.* 18. 5.) —From whence alſo *Timothy* was ſhortly after removed; for *Apollo*, not He, is ſaid to have been the Waterer of that Goſpel, which the Apoſtle had there planted. From *Corinth* S. *Paul* went for *Jeruſalem*, to be there at the Feaſt, taking *Epheſus* in his way, but not ſtaying there: Afterwards returns again to *Epheſus*, and

§ 85. *n.* 2. —— 2. ϱ. ——

and making long abode there: and, here, we find *Timothy* with him. Whom he ſendeth away again thence: * to *Corinth* (1 *Cor.* 4. 17.---16. 8, 10. *Apollos* having left that place, and reſiding now at *Epheſus*, verſ. 12.) * and to *Macedonia* (*Act.* 19. 22.). From which Journey *Timothy* being returned to *Epheſus*, here S. *Paul* leaveth him behind him, at his going into *Macedonia* (1 *Tim.* 1. 3.). After *Timothy*'s being left at *Epheſus* only for a ſeaſon (1 *Tim.* 1. 3.) He removed from thence, and came again to S. *Paul* into *Macedonia*, and there he was with him at his writing of the ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* (ſee 2 *Cor.* 1. 1.): and ſo travelled with him to *Corinth* (ſee *Rom.* 16. 21.): and from thence returned with him into *Aſia* (ſee *Act.* 20. 3, 4, 5, 6.). After this S. *Paul* is found, to have ſent for him to *Rome* (2 *Tim.* 4. 9, 21.—1. 4.); and to have ſent for him, not from *Epheſus*, but from ſome other place; for, in the ſame Epiſtle, S. *Paul* gives him an account, that amongſt his Companions diſtributed into divers parts he had ſent to *Epheſus*, *Tychicus* (2 *Tim.* 4. 12.): Therefore *Timothy* himſelf was not then at *Epheſus*. To *Rome* he came; and there he was a Priſoner with S. *Paul* (*Heb.* 13. 23.): and there was with him, when he writ the Epiſtles to the *Coloſſians*, to the *Philippians*, to *Philemon*, as appeareth, (*Col.* 1. 1. *Phil.* 1. 1. *Philem.* 1.): Only the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* S. *Paul* writ from *Rome*, before *Timothy* came to him; for he ſent that Epiſtle by *Tychicus* at the ſame time, when he writ for *Timothy* to come to him (ſee *Eph.* 6. 2. compared with 2 *Tim.* 4. 12.); Yet maketh he, in that Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, no mention of *Timothy*, their ſuppoſed Biſhop. Laſtly, from *Rome* we find that the Apoſtle intendeth to ſend *Timothy*, not to *Epheſus*, but to *Philippi* (*Phil.* 2. 19. 20.) and alſo to carry him with him into *Judea* (*Heb.* 13. 23.) probably for the ſame affairs, wherein he employed him at *Epheſus*.

§. 85. *n.* 3. This for *Timothy*: and the like may be ſaid of *Titus*. For, after a ſmall time of his ſtay in *Creet*, probably being

being left there, when S. *Paul* went from *Macedonia* into *Greece* (*Act.* 20. 2.), he was ſent for to *Nicopolis* *Tit.* 3. 12. by the Apoſtle reſiding then in ſome part of *Greece*, and purpoſing an excurſion to *Illyricum*, from which Journey to *Illyricum*, being returned again to *Corinth*, he writes to the *Romans*, that he had no more place in thoſe parts, *Rom.* 15. 23. —And if his two Journies from S. *Paul* to *Corinth* (mentioned 2 *Cor.* 2. 12. ——and 8. 6.) were not after this abode of *Titus* in *Creet*, yet he is found again with S. *Paul* in *Rome*, and thence he departed, not to *Creet*, but to *Dalmatia* (2 *Tim.* 4. 10.).

3. Laſtly, σ thoſe words to *Timothy* [*as I beſought thee to abide ſtill at* Epheſus, *ſo do.* 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. compared with 3. 14— 4. 13.]; and thoſe to *Titus* [*For this cauſe left I thee in* Creet], imply only an occaſional employment, and do not ſound like words of an enſtallment into a Biſhoprick.——τ¹ However, that Ordination of theſe Perſons *by the Presbytery* (ſee 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.) ſheweth, that their Dignity was not advanced above the Presbytery in ſuch a manner, as modern Epiſcopacy is: and, that the Presbyters then impoſed hands in the Ordinations of the higheſt Church-Officers. τ² And here alſo they further obſerve‖, That, in all the Texts, where mention is made of Impoſition of hands, ἐπίθεσις is joyned with χειρῶν in the plural; not with χειρὸς, or, χεῖρ in the Singular or Dual, number; and ſo there muſt of neceſſity be more than one impoſer of hands.

§. 85. *n.* 4.

σ.

τ¹

τ²

‖ *Jus Div. Miniſt. Evang.* p. 183.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

§. 86. Their Arguments out of the *Fathers*.

THeſe are their Proofs out of the *Scriptures*. Next, out of the *Fathers*, they ſhew, the next Writers after the Apoſtle's times, who lived in the firſt Century, ſpeaking of Church-Offices much after the ſame manner. —— υ So *Clemens Romanus*, in his undoubted Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, reciting the Orders of Church-Officers expreſly limits them to two, *Biſhops* and *Deacons*: and, whom in one place he calleth Biſhops, he nameth Presbyters in another. —— φ So *Polycarp*, S. *John*'s Diſciple, writing to the *Philippians* mentioneth only two Orders, Biſhops and Deacons; and exhorteth the *Philippians* to be ſubject *Presbyteris & Diaconis, ſicut Deo & Chriſto. Presbyteris ſicut Deo*; therefore Presbyters the higheſt. —— χ¹ They produce *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Irenæus*, and others, in the ſecond Century, calling uſually the Biſhop in their times by the name of Presbyter; as that Age not having yet forgotten their former Parity. χ² The Teſtimony of *Epiphanius* ‖ alſo is urged, who, in Anſwer to *Aërius* his Objections, grants: That the Apoſtles, as, in ſome places, they inſtituted a Government of Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons: and, in ſome, of a Biſhop only, and his Deacons: ſo, in ſome others, a Government only of Presbyters and Deacons.

υ.

φ.

χ¹

χ²

‖ *Hær.* 75. Mr. *Stillingf. Iren.* p. 328.

§. 87.

They urge likewiſe ſeveral places out of the later *Fathers* confeſſing, primitively, either none at all, or very little, difference between the Authority of Presbyter, and Biſhop: amongſt theſe, eſpecially S. *Hierome*: —— ↓ out of whom they quote, △ that comment of his upon *Tit.* 1. 5, 6, 7. recited before (§. 76. n. 2.) where alſo this Father urgeth, for the proof of this primitive Identity of Biſhops and Presbyters, * *Phil.* 1. 1. * *Act.* 20. 17, 28. * *Heb.* 13. 17, 24. ſpoken in the plural. After which; *Hæc propterea*, ſaith he, *ut oſtenderemus*,

↓.

ſtenderemus, apud veteres eoſdem fuiſſe Presbyteros, quos & Epiſcopos; paulatim *verò (ut diſſentionum plantaria evellerentur), ad unum omnem ſollicitudinem eſſe delatam. Sicut ergo Presbyteri ſciunt, ſe ex Eccleſiæ conſuetudine, ei, qui ſibi præpoſitus fuerit, eſſe ſubjectos; ita Epiſcopi noverint, ſe magis conſuetudine, quàm diſpoſitionis dominicæ veritate, Presbyteris eſſe majores, & in commune debere Eccleſiam regere.* ——And △ another like it, in Ep. 85. *ad* Evagrium. Where alſo he ſaith; *Apoſtolus perſpicuè docet, eoſdem eſſe Presbyteros, quos & Epiſcopos.* And quoteth again the ſame Scriptures; Adding ſome others to them. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. —— 2 *Jo.* 1.—3 *Jo.* 1. Where S. *John* the Apoſtle ſtileth himſelf Presbyter. His words are. *Quæris authoritatem? audi teſtimonium.* Paulus & Timotheus, *&c, omnibus Sanctis, qui ſunt* Philippis, *cum Epiſcopis & Diaconis.——vis & aliud? In Actibus Apoſtolorum ad unius Eccleſiæ Sacerdotes ita* Paulus *loquitur. Attendite vobis, & cuncto gregi, in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus poſuit Epiſcopos. Ac ne quis contentiosè in unâ Eccleſiâ plures Epiſcopos fuiſſe contendat, audi & aliud teſtimonium, in quo manifeſtiſſimè comprobatur eundem eſſe Epiſcopum atque Presbyterum: Propter hoc reliqui te* Cretæ, *ut conſtitueres Presbyteros per civitates, &c. Oportet enim Epiſcopum ſine crimine eſſe*, &c. *Et ad* Timotheum. *Noli negligere gratiam, quæ in te eſt per impoſitionem manuum Presbyterii. Sed &* Petrus. *Presbyteros, inquit, in vobis precor Compresbyter—— regere gregem Chriſti, & inſpicere*, &c. *Quod quidem græcè ſignificantius dicitur* ἐπισκοποῦντες, i. e. *ſuperintendentes. Parva tibi videntur tantorum virorum teſtimonia? Clangat tuba Evangelica, filius tonitrui. Presbyter electæ Dominæ, & filiis ejus*, &c. *Presbyter* Caio *chariſſimo*, &c. After which the Father goes on.—— *Quod autem* poſtea *unus electus eſt*, &c. as it is cited before (§. 76. n. 2.) In which places of S. *Hierom*, the Presbyterians ſhew thoſe words, *in toto orbe decretum eſt, ut unus*, &c, in the firſt —— *& poſtea unus electus eſt*, in the ſecond, they ſhew, I ſay, that theſe words cannot be ſo underſtood, as if this change were made in the Apoſtles times; as

ſome would fain interpret them: becauſe this Father urgeth the very laſt writings of the Apoſtles, and thoſe of the very laſt of all the Apoſtles ſurviving the reſt, to ſhew the identity of Biſhops and Presbyters in thoſe times, and then infers his [*poſtea*] and [*paulatim*,] &c.——With this Father they joine *Iſidore Hiſpal. de Divin. offic.* l. 2. c. 7. as ſpeaking muchwhat the ſame things.

§. 88. ω Next to S. *Hierome*, they make uſe of thoſe comments on S. *Paul*'s Epiſtles bearing the name of S. *Ambroſe*, but they are of one *Hilarius*, (for ſo S. *Auſtin* ‖ quotes them) a Roman Deacon (ſaith *Blondel*) contemporary to S. *Ambroſe*. Out of them they quote * that paſſage, in Eph. 4. 11. —— *Non per omnia conveniunt*, &c, cited before (§. 76. n. 1.) αα¹ and that in 1 *Tim.* 3. 8.——*Poſt Epiſcopum Diaconatus ordinationem ſubjecit. Quare? niſi, quia Epiſcopi & Presbyteri una ordinatio eſt? uterque enim Sacerdos eſt.*——And * αα² another paſſage of the ſame Author in S. *Auſtin*'s works *Quæſt. de utroque Teſt.* 101. to ſhew Ordination, in the Biſhop's abſence, performable by a Presbyter.——*Nam in* Alexandriâ, *& per totam* Egyptum, *ſi deſit Epiſcopus, conſecrat Presbyter.*——cc And * that paſſage on 1 *Tim.* 5. 1. to ſhew the uſurpation of Biſhops, in the latter times, upon the priviledges of Miniſters and people (*Jus divin.* part. 2. p. 121.)——*Seniorem ne increpaveris*, &c. On which Text thus that Author.——*Apud omnes utique gentes honorabilis eſt ſenectus. Unde Synagoga, & poſtea Eccleſia Seniores habuit, quorum ſine conſilio nil agebatur in Eccleſiâ. Quod quâ negligentiâ obſoleverit, neſcio; niſi fortè doctorum deſidiâ* [that would not take the pains to conſult them]; *aut magis ſuperbiâ, dum ſoli volunt aliquid videri*, [that thought the others advice nothing worth].

ω. ‖ *De* 2. Epiſt. *Pelag.* l. 4.---- *adverſ. Julian.* l. 2. c. 164. αα¹ —— αα² ——

§. 89. ψ To *Hilarius* they add S. *Chryſoſtome* (*Hom.* 11. in 1 *Tim.* 3. 8. —— *Poſtquam de Epiſcopis dixit —— omiſſo Presbyterorum ordine, ad Diaconos tranſiit. Cur id quæſo? Quia, ſcil. inter Epiſcopum, atque Presbyterum intereſt fermè*

ψ ——

fermè nihil. Quippe & Presbyteris Ecclesiæ cura permissa est, & quæ de Episcopis dixit, ea etiam Presbyteris congruunt. Solâ quippe ordinatione superiores illi sunt; atque hoc tantùm, plusquam Presbyteri, habere videntur.

ss They alledge likewise that civility of S. *Augustine* Ep. 19. *ad Hieron.* —— *Quamvis enim,* secundùm honorum vocabula, quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, *Episcopatus Presbyterio major sit, tamen in multis rebus* Augustinus Hieronymo *minor est.*—— §. 90.

ss

ee As for the Catalogues of successive, particular Bishops in several Cities from the Apostle's times, which are found in Antiquity; (see before §. 42. *n.* 2.) They say, *that these Catalogues accord not one with another* ζζ *that amongst the Presbyters, who governed with equal power, the line and succession was deduced from one, who was the first of them that were ordained, for the more expedite way of reckoning* (see Jus Divin. part. 2. p. 124.) —— nn *That they, that made the Catalogues, spake according to the language of their own times; in which times there was a distinction between Bishops and Presbyters:* (ib. p. 125.) — θθ *That we may not erect an Office in the Church which is not found in Scripture, upon general appellations, or titles, and allusions, frequently found in the Fathers; especially when they spake vulgarly, and not as to a point in debate: and that* Jerom *spake so, when he recorded, that* Timothy *and* Titus *were made Bishops by S.* Paul's *Ordination.* (Answer at *Newport, Oct.* 17. p. 19.).——*That* Eusebius, Irenæus, *and others delivered to posterity those things, which they received from their forefathers, without strict examination, and thereby in many things deceived themselves; and were the cause of deceiving others.* (Jus. Divin. 2. part. p. 64.). §. 91.

ee

ζζ

nn

θθ

As to the general practice of Antiquity, to which they are required to be conformable, they alledge xx *That there were many corruptions, which crept into the Church in the very infancy of it, and were generally received as Apostolical Traditions; which yet notwithstanding are not defended by our Episcopal men, but many of them acknowledged to be errors, and mistakes; as the Millenary opinion;* §. 92.

xx

neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants; thoſe four cuſtomes,
‖ Baſil *de Sp. S. c.* 27. *which S.* Baſil ‖ *nameth, as Apoſtolical Traditions;* * *ſigning men with the ſign of the Croſs.* * *Praying towards the Eaſt.* * *Anointing with Oile.* * *Standing up at prayers from* Eaſter to Whitſuntide (ibid. p. 100.). λλ *That the diſtinction between a Biſhop and a Presbyter, when it firſt began in the Church, was not grounded upon a* jus Divinum, *but upon prudential reaſons, chiefly in* remedium ſchiſmatis.—*That this prudential way was not the way of God, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt, who could foreſee what would enſue thereupon, would never ordain that for a remedy, which would not only be ineffectual to the cutting off of evil;* μμ *but become a ſtirrup for Antichriſt to get into the ſaddle:* νν *for if there be a neceſſity of ſetting up one Biſhop over many Presbyters, for preventing ſchiſme; there is as great a neceſſity of ſetting up one Archbiſhop over many Biſhops, and one Patriarch over many Archbiſhops; and one Pope over all; unleſs men will imagine, that there is a danger of ſchiſme only among Presbyters, and not among Biſhops, and Archbiſhops, which is contrary to reaſon, truth, hiſtory, and experience.* (ibid. append. prop. 5.) οο *That they intend not to be finally concluded* * *by the determination of Apoſtolical Traditions unwriten* [*i.e.* in Scripture]: *or* * *by the Fathers, or Canons of the Church, in this great controverſy. For they know* ππ *that the ancient Church was much beguiled in receiving many things as Traditions Apoſtolical, which are confeſſed by all to have been Apocryphal* [here they name Chriſt's preaching *ultra quadrageſimum aut etiam quinquageſimum annum*: and the *Aſian* Biſhops celebrating *Eaſter* on the fourteenth day of the month.]—*That though the ancient Fathers were famous Lights in the Church, yet they had their* nævos *and* παραγράμματα; —ρρ *and their Writings much defaced by the Popiſh* Index expurgatorius: —— σσ *and that a learned Gentleman* [in the margin Lord *Digby*] *undertaketh in a ſhort Epiſtle to make out* * *their contradictions one to another; their variance from themſelves;* * *their Repugnances both to Proteſtants, and Papiſts; their want of abilty, in many points of our controverſies; in moſt, of will, to decide them.* (This *ibid.* in the concluſion

cluſion of the book). [Where you may diſcerne; that all this ſhifting and ſhrugging to remove and throw off the authority of Antiquity, is a ſigne, that it ſits very cloſe upon them, and pincheth them ſore].

As for their being accuſed of *Arianiſme*; they affirm §. 93. *n.* 1. ττ *That* Aerius *was never condemned, by any councel, of hereſy, for holding the identity of a Biſhop and a Presbyter. That he was called an Heretick by* Epiphanius *and* Auſtin; *but this eſpecially, if not only, becauſe he was an* Arian. *But, as for his opinion, that there ought to be no difference between a Biſhop and a Presbyter; that* Auſtin *indeed calleth it* proprium Dogma, *and Epiphanius,* dogma furioſum & ſtolidum; *but not Hereſy.* ττ

That, ſuppoſe they did, yet this was but the private opinion of theſe two Doctors: And υυ not much to be regarded, §. 93. *n.* 2. *becauſe the ſame Authors condemne him as much, for reprehending and cenſuring praying and offering for the dead; and the performing of good works for the benefit of the dead.* Epiphanius *accuſeth him, becauſe he ſaid, that*—— ſuperſtitum preces non opitulantur eis, qui ex hâc vitâ diſceſſerunt. Auſtin, *becauſe he ſaid,* non licet orare, vel offerre oblationem pro mortuis. *He is further condemned, for reprehending* ſtata jejunia, *and the keeping of the Week before* Eaſter *as a ſolemn faſt. Which things, if worthy of condemnation, would bring in moſt of the Reformed Churches into the cenſure of Hereſy; and make moſt of our Epiſcopal men Hereticks.* (ibid. Append. prop. 7.). υυ

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

§. 94. *n.* 1. Their Arguments in particular concerning Presbyterial Ordination, that it was anciently, allowed, practiſed.

AS for Ordination, the chief priviledge, above Presbyters, that is claimed by Biſhops, and without which (for ſupplying more ſucceſſors) the government of Presbyters falleth, as ſoon as ſet up; in the vindication of this, as due to them, they take great pains, and ſeek out all helps. Firſt, they challenge an eſſential or intrinſecal power to ordain other Presbyters conferred on every Presbyter by vertue of his Orders. φφ1. Which they ſhew, both to be granted

1. —— φφ1. —— by the Epiſcopal party, quoting the Doctrine of Biſhop *Downham* (*ib. Append. prop.* 8.)—and of Mr. *Maſon* in his defence of the Ordination of the Proteſtant Miniſters beyond Seas (*append. prop.* 3.): and referring to that of *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, *Field*, (in his *l.* 3. *c.* 39.) and many others, collected by Mr. *Baxter* in his *Chriſtian Concord.*

2. —— And, 2ly. they endeavour to prove it by ſeveral *mediums*, and inſtances.

§. 94. *n.* 2. 1. φφ2. —— φφ2. Firſt, becauſe, by many ancient Canons, Presbyters, are joined together with Biſhops for the Ordination of Presbyters, in which Canons alſo is required the Presbyter's impoſition of hands. See theſe Canons cited before §. 65. *n.* 5. which therefore I forbear here to repeat. So that (Thus) Ordination, as it were, equally dependeth on, and is divided between, the Biſhop and his Presbytery; if not they without him; ſo neither he without them, being able to do any thing herein.

§. 94. *n.* 3. 2. χχ —— 1. 2ly. χχ Becauſe, firſt, Biſhops receive this power of Ordaining, not by vertue of their Juriſdiction, but of their Orders. This confeſſed, by *Bellarmine*, *de Confir. l.* 2. *c.* 12. §. *Sed inſtant.*—— by *Eſtius* in 4. *ſent. d.* 7. §. 21. for theſe reaſons, 1. becauſe, though his Juriſdiction be reſtrained or taken away from a Biſhop, yet his Ordinations, if done, are valid: valid alſo towards thoſe, over whom he hath no Juriſdiction: Again, invalid, after the

the Biſhop hath received Juriſdiction, if done before his Conſecration: Laſtly, becauſe this power of Ordination is uncommunicable to other Inferiors, to whom yet the Acts of Juriſdiction are communicable. The power of Ordination therefore is from the Biſhop's Order. But then 2ly. The Order of Biſhop and of Presbyter are both one and the ſame; ſo as that that, which is added in Epiſcopal Conſecration, is neither Sacrament of Order, nor imprinteth a Character; As is confeſſed by the moſt, and famouſeſt, of the Schoolmen; and particularly by *Bellarmine* himſelf, who, ſometimes of another opinion, yet afterward, in the Recognition of his works, acknowledgeth; ——*Rectius dixiſſem, Presbyteratum, & Epiſcopatum eſſe unum Ordinem, ſed gradus diverſos.* ⸸ The nobleſt act of which Order, or of any Office whatever, namely *conficere* or *conſecrare corpus Chriſti*, is granted to belong to the Presbyter. See all this largely ſet down in *Maſon*'s Defence, &c, §. 9, &c, and referred to *in Jus Divin. Miniſt. Append. prop.* 3. p. 132. ⸸ Beſides which, ſome obſerve that in the form of Conſecration of a Biſhop there is no new Authority ſpecified to be conferred on him, but only the ſame words repeated, which are uſed in the Ordering of Prieſts; *Receive the Holy Ghoſt.* See Mr. *Prin*'s unbiſhoping of *Timothy*, p. 109. This they ſay of Biſhops Ordaining only by vertue of their Orders: and, then, their Order granted to be the ſame with that of Presbyters.

2. ⸸ ⸸

⸸ ⸸

3ly. They go on to confirm the Presbyter's power of Ordaining, becauſe, anciently, it hath not been held unlawfull for a Presbyter to ordain alone without a Biſhop, and ſome meer Presbyters have been permitted to do it; or, they doing it without permiſſion, it hath ſtood valid. Which things appear by ſeveral inſtances. ωω ▵ By what S. *Hierome* ſaith of the Church of *Alexandria*; that the Presbyters there for many years did ordain their Biſhops.——*Presbyteri unum ex ſe electum, in excelſiori gradu collocatum, Epiſcopum nominabant,*

§. 94. n. 4.

3.

ωω

minabant, &c, cited before (§. 76. n. 2.): and, if they
aa might ordain Bishops, then also Presbyters. aa Add to this, that *Pelagius* Bishop of *Rome* A.D. 555. (introduced by *Justinian* the Emperour) was ordained only by two Bishops, and a Presbyter, the rest of the Bishops withdrawing themselves from him, because suspected by them of concurring to the death of *Vigilius* his predecessor, &c: of which he afterward cleared himself, and was accepted by them, yet not re-ordained.

§. 94. n. 5. bb △ By the liberty indulged to the *Chorepiscopi*, who were but single Presbyters, to ordain, if they had a licence from the Bishop. * That they might ordain, if having a licence, is proved cc from *Conc. Ancyran.*
cc c. 13. —— *Chorepiscopis non licere Presbyteros vel Diaconos ordinare; sed neque urbis Presbyteris, nisi cùm literis ab Episcopo permissum fuerit, in alienâ* [or, as others read it, *in unaquâque*, ἑκάστῃ, not ἑτέρᾳ,] *provinciâ.* —— And from *Conc. Antioc.* c. 10. —— Now, a licence cannot confer a power one hath not, but only a faculty to exercise that power one already hath. bb Again, * that they were meer Presbyters is gathered, in that they wanted many proprieties of Bishops; because they were ordained, not by three, but one, Bishop; were not City-but country-Bishops; were subject to the City-Bishop; might not exercise Ordination without his leave; at last, had it quite taken away from them. Which power of Ordination had they had as Bishops, the taking it away would have been their degradation, (see *Jus Divin. Append. prop.* 4.).

§. 94. n. 6. dd △ By *Novatus*, (a Presbyter of S. *Cyprian*) his
dd Ordaining one *Felicissimus* for his Deacon, blamed in this by S. *Cyprian*, only because he did it without either his permission, or knowledge. *Cyprian* Ep. 49. *Ipse* [Novatus] *est, qui* Felicissimum *satellitem suum, Diaconum suum, nec permittente me, nec sciente, sed factione & ambitione, constituit.* (Urged by *Blondel Apol.* p. 312.)
ee[1]. ee[1]. △ By the Relation, in *Cassian*'s *Collat.* ‖ concerning *Paphnutius*, a Presbyter in the desert of *Scetis*

‖ *Collat.* l. 4. c. 1.

in

in *Egypt*, ordaining one Abbot *Daniel* first Deacon, and afterward Presbyter: the words are.—Abbas Daniel à *B.* Paphnutio *solitudinis ejusdem Presbytero, & quidem cùm multis junior esset ætate, ad Diaconii est prælatus officium.* —And again.—*Nequaquam ferens in inferiori eum ministerio diutius immorari, optánsque sibimet successorem dignissimum providere, superstes eum Presbyterii honore provexit.* *Blondel Apol.* p. 357.

ee² △ By the Orthodox People in *Antiochia* their making other Bishops to themselves, when, in the *Arian* Persecution under *Valens* (about A. D. 376.), all the Orthodox Bishops were expelled, as *Epiphanius* testifieth *l.* 3. *Hæres.* 73. c. 28.—*Fuerunt enim populi plures hujus ordinis ipsius Synodi* [Nicenæ] *qui sibi ipsis Episcopos constituentes, profitentur de filio mirabiliter, & vocem ὁμοούσιον non rejiciunt.* Whence *Blondel* ‖ argues; that, the Orthodox Bishops being all removed, and the *Arian* Party and their Bishops renounced, therefore these must have their Bishops ordained by meer Presbyters. § 94. *n.* 7. ee². ‖ *Apol.* p. 353.

ff¹ △ By S. *Leo*'s ordering (Ep. 92. *ad Rusticum Narbonensem Episcopum,*) that the Ordination of any Clergy by counterfeit Bishops should not be valid, except the true Bishop of the place assent to, and allow of, it.---*Leo*'s words are.—*Nulla ratio sinit, ut inter Episcopos habeantur, qui nec à Clericis sunt electi, nec à plebibus expetiti, nec à provincialibus Episcopis cùm Metropolitani judicio consecrati. Unde, cùm sæpè quæstio de malè accepto honore nascatur, quis ambiget, nequaquam istis esse tribuendum, quod non docetur fuisse collatum? Si qui autem Clerici ab istis Pseud. Episcopis in eis Ecclesiis ordinati sint, quæ ad proprios Episcopos pertinebant, & ordinatio eorum cum consensu & judicio Præsidentium facta est, potest rata haberi, ità ut in ipsis Ecclesiis perseverent. Aliter autem vana est habenda ordinatio, quæ nec loco fundata est, nec authoritate munita.* Whence *D. Blondel* contendeth, p. 267. that the Ordinations of Clergy by meer Presbyters, if only ratified by the true Bishop's consent, were firm and good. §. 94. *n.* 8. ff¹.

ff² △ By the *Scotish* Nation being governed 220. years and more, by Presbyters without Bishops: therefore § 94. *n.* 9. ff².

theſe Presbyters, there, ordained others for that time. ff 3. See *Jus divin. Appen.* p. 141. quoting *Blondel.* ff 3. Again; ▵ By ſeveral Engliſh Biſhops, *Aidan, Finan, Colman,* and others, ordained by Scotiſh Presbyters, the Abbot and ‖ *Apol.* p. 367. &c. Monk of *Hye.* For which *Blondel* ‖ quotes thoſe words in *Ven. Bede,* Hiſt. l. 3. c. 4. —*Habere autem ſolet ipſa Inſula* [Hye] *rectorem ſemper Abbatem Presbyterum, cujus juri & omnis provincia* [Scotorum] *& ipſi etiam Epiſcopi, ordine inuſitato, debeant eſſe ſubjecti.* —and c. 5. Where the Father ſaith, that, a *conventus Seniorum* being aſſembled, Aidanum *ordinantes ad prædicandum miſerunt.* —and c. 4. & 5, *&c.* Where ſeveral other Biſhops are ſaid to be *Ordinati à Scotis.*

§. 94. *n.* 10. In the laſt place; ▵ by the Eccleſiaſtical Canons prohibiting meer Presbyters, to ordain, confirm, &c. from which it is argued; that, before ſuch Prohibition, ſuch things were by the Presbyters rightly and lawfully performed. Here thoſe words of 2. *Conc. Hiſpalenſ. c.* 7. are ‖ Blond. *Apol.* p. 75. 310. *Mr.* Stillingfl. *Iren.* p. 314. brought in ‖: ——*Nam quamvis cum Epiſcopis plurima illis miniſteriorum communis ſit diſpenſatio, quædam novellis & Eccleſiaſticis regulis ſibi prohibita noverint: ſicut Presbyterorum, & Diaconorum, & Virginum conſecratio, &c.* In this D. *Blondel* is frequent: * reaſoning thus in full Syllogiſme, in the concluſion of his Chapter *de Ordinationibus* p. 378. gg *Quæcunque regulis novellis prohibita eſſe noſcuntur, antè libera fuerunt. Sed ordinare, confirmare, &c, regulis novellis prohibita eſſe noſcuntur: ergo.*——And then again, againſt the preſent Obligation of thoſe Canons, reaſoning thus, ——*Quæcunque antè libera fuerunt, novo Eccleſiarum conſenſu accedente, libera deinceps eſſe poſſunt.* (or; *Regulæ Eccleſiæ ſunt jus tantùm humanum; ſed jura omnia humana, eodem, quo condita & acceptata ſunt, arbitrio, abrogari poſſunt.*)——And then again, concerning the lawfulneſs of any one part of the Church to reverſe ſuch Laws without the conſent of the reſt, (elſe his former Syllogiſms do him no ſervice) * reaſoning thus.—— hh *Quæcunque Eccleſia jus humanum, in quod ante quomodocunque conſenſerat, pro arbitrio abrogavit, cùm propria & indefectibili poteſtate*

gg

hh

potestate usa sit, [a supposition of his left unproved, as if it were universally conceded], *in aliarum Ecclesiarum reprehensiones incurrere non debet; sed Ecclesiæ Protestantium jus humanum, &c, abrogarunt: ergo.* And * thus p. 177. — kk *Regula* [or Canon] *potest abrogari, si, in complures gravis, hoc ipso, contra præscripti cœlitus juris normam militare videatur.* —— Again, to Bishop *Bilson* urging such Canons, * thus; p. 144, 145. —— ll *Utut consuetudines, Canones, Decretalia congeras; nec vel latum unguem adversus eos promoves, quos ipsa antiquitatis monumenta docuerunt, quo tempore, quibus consiliis, &c, primogenea Presbyterorum potestas in gratiam præpositorum humanitus institutorum imminuta, aut tandem labefactata sit.* —— and p. 345. mm *Quicquid Synodorum Canonibus cautum hic proferri potest, serò* (*i.e.* post Annum 300.) *inolitæ consuetudini datum, eos non urget, qui inveteratum quemlibet morem contrario usu, vel saltem desuetudine, pro conditione temporum, abrogari posse ac debere norunt.* —— nn Lastly, (p. 178.) he pleadeth, —— *Etsi nihil in Conciliis non sanctum decretum demus, eo nequaquam, si noluerint, tenebuntur Presbyteri, jure divino pares, quos nemo decernentium vocavit ad consiliorum gestorumque participationem.* Thus *Blondel.*—See the like arguing in *Jus Divin.* Part 2. p. 131. ——

kk — ll — mm — nn —

4ly. That it is a received opinion in the Church of *Rome*, that the *Pope* may, by his Commission, authorize a single Presbyter to ordain Presbyters, (*Append.* p. 141.) of which see the proof in *Mason*'s Defence, p. 161. and 167. Those *Roman* Writers holding, that the Apostles, for the better preventing of Schisms, restrained this power of Ordination, which *jure Divino* was received in common by all Presbyters, only to some, *viz.* Bishops; and therefore, that, this being only Apostolical (*i.e.* Ecclesiastical) and not Divine, Constitution, the *Pope* hath power to dispense therein. oo And for this cause it is, that in the *Council* of *Florence* ‖ as the Bishop is called *Ordinarius Minister Confirmationis*, so also *Ordinationis*, or *Ordinis*. pp But, if Bishops held such power of Ordination *jure Divino*, then 'tis granted by the Romanists themselves,

§. 94. n. 11. — 4. — oo. — ‖ *Decret. de sac. ordin.* — pp

ſelves, that ſuch power could upon no terms or cauſes whatſoever, by any Perſon be diſpenſed, or committed, to any other. See *Bell. de Concil.* l. 2. c 18. ——and *de Clericis* l. 1. c. 18. §. *non eſſe*: In which matter thus *Blondel*, Apol. Præfat. p. 60. —*Ii omnes, qui Presbyteros ſimplices, ſive ex neceſſitate, ſive ex delegatione tam Papæ, quàm aliorum, ordinare poſſe putant, fateri tenentur vetitas Presbyteris Ordinationes non niſi Canonico jure. Nulli autem poteſtas eſt ſupra jus divinum, ut, quod illius interdicto vetitum eſt, permittat; aut, quod illius interdicto vetitum eſt & ligatum, ſolvat.* ——Again; ——*Nulla incumbere neceſſitas poteſt, quæ Dei voluntate major ſit.* Thus he.

§. 94. *n.* 12. qq 5ly. at leaſt a ſingle Presbyter, according to the common tenet, may by the *Pope's* Diſpenſation *confirm* (ſee before §. 68. *n.* 4.), and therefore why not ordain alſo? ‖ *Seeing that both are proper to the Biſhop, both derived from the ſame Character, received at the ſame inſtant, from the ſame Perſons, by the ſame words, and to the ſame effect*, viz. *the imprinting of a Character, and giving the Holy Ghoſt.*

qq

5.

‖ Maſon's defence 166.

§. 94. *n.* 13. Yet further, 6ly. rr ſince, though the right of baptizing was given by Chriſt's own Commiſſion to the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors; *i. e.* only to ſuch as are in Holy Orders: yet the exerciſe of this power is allowed ‖, in ſome caſes, to a Lay-man, to a Woman, to a Pagan, that was never baptized himſelf; Why may not Ordination, in ſome caſes, alſo be performed by Presbyters? ſſ Doth not a Presbyter come nearer to a Biſhop, ſeeing they are both one Order, than a Pagan to a Presbyter; and with what face can one affirm, that this Pagan may give that Character, which himſelf hath not in baptizing; and that the Presbyter cannot give that Character, which he hath in Ordination? tt eſpecially when we conſider, that as, Baptiſm is neceſſary for Salvation in reſpect of particular Perſons, ſo are Orders in reſpect of the whole Church.

rr

6.

‖ Maſon's defence, p. 170.

ſſ

tt

§. 94. *n.* 14. 7ly. *That*, uu *ſince Presbyters have original and intrinſecal power of Ordination*; ‖ *and that it is reſtrained in them only by Eccleſiaſtical, or Apoſtolical Conſtitution; which conſtitution and reſtraint alſo is held to be diſpenſable and releaſeable by the*

uu

7.

‖ Mai. p. 168.

the Pope: *it seemeth reasonable, that in a case of necessity, which is above Laws, also they themselves may resume and exercise this intrinsecal Power.*

For, ww *suppose all Bishops in the World were dead, or were infected with Heresie, and would ordain none, but those that would approve their Heresies, should Ordination cease? Or, if continued, by whom should it be performed? Again;* xx *That such a case of necessity there was in the beginning of the Reformation, when the* Roman *Bishops would ordain none, but in a* Popish *manner, and to a Popish sacrificing Priesthood, with an Oath to maintain the* Pope, *and promise of upholding other evident abuses. And as they could not obtain Ordination from the Popish Churches; so neither from the* Greek, *by the same Reason; these being convicted of Heresie (as the Romanists confess), and whose Doctrine they justly disliked; and no Church being willing to give Orders, but only to such as approve their Doctrines. Being then thus excluded* (as Master *Mason* goeth on) *from the* Greek *and the* Latin, *from the* East *and the* West, *what should be done? False Prophets were (like Wolves) to be driven away; and Godly Preachers planted in their places. Whence these to be had? The Bishops persecuted the Reformers. No supply, but by Ordination. This therefore either to be devolved upon Presbyters; or the Church of God to suffer most lamentable Ruine.* For this see Mr. *Mason's* Defence, p. 171. &c. §. 94. n. 15. ww xx

8ly. But, yy suppose no necessity, at the beginning of the Reformation, of Presbyterial Ordination; yet, if it ought not to have been done then, at least being then done, it stands valid; because the Validity or Real effect of such an act followeth the power that Presbyters receive, from their Orders, and Christ's Institution; not from the Licence or Warrant they have either from their Superiors, or from Necessity. So, a Bishop's Ordaining, Absolving, or Confirming, *&c.* who is by his Superiors justly restrained from the exercise of any such Function, yet done once is effectual; and cannot be annulled. §. 94. n. 16. 8. yy.

zz^t. 9ly. As

§. 94. n. 17. ZZ[1]. 9[ly]. As for the Discountenance and disallowance, which Antiquity hath shewed toward such Presbyter—Ordinations, *it was not, for that they are against the Canon of Scripture; but* ‖ *for that they were against the Canons of some Councils.* ZZ[2]. *Which Antiquity likewise made all Ordinations of Presbyters* sine titulo, *or done by Bishops, without leave, out of their own Dioceses, or Ordinations of Bishops performed by fewer than three Bishops, to be therefore void.*

9. ZZ[1].

‖ *Jus Divin. Appen. prop. 6. p. 143.*

ZZ[2].

Part

Part IV.

CHAP. I.

§. 95. An Answer to this their Plea.

THus have I set You down, somwhat at large, the *Presbyterian Plea*, that nothing material might be concealed from you in a Controversie, which is still on foot and hotly agitated. In returning Answers to the particulars whereof, I hope I may be excused in using some brevity: because I have already shewed, 1. That such a superior Authority, as is now claimed by Bishops, (namely for ordaining Presbyters, inflicting Censures, &c,) was given by the Apostles to *Timothy*, and *Titus*, to *James*, and *Mark*, and divers others (see §. 38. &c.). 2. And that the same Authority for the foresaid acts was continued in the Church, (by a constant Succession) to other single Persons from them, whose Names, Successions, and superior Functions, the Writers of the first Ages have left registred to Posterity: (see §. 42. &c.): Now, what better Interpreter can there be of the meaning of the Scriptures; or, of the Constitutions of the Apostles, than the practice of the Church herein, that next followed them? 3. To which yet I have added the Declaration of the Church of Later Ages (see §. 52, &c.) that such Episcopal Authority, as in their times was exercised, (and that was the same, which now) was instituted at the very first by the Apostles; the Declaration of the one, and the Practice of the other, sufficiently securing (if any thing can) the Episcopal cause in this Controversie.

1.

2.

3.

§. 96. Before which, a review of their Concessions.

Only, before I enter upon any reply, I must first remind you of the Concessions (very considerable) which are made by the Presbyterians themselves in this

this matter, (already delivered in §. 73, &c.). Who first grant, that in the Apostle's times such a superior Authority, as Bishops now claim, was commited to, and used by, *Timothy* and *Titus* (see before §. 73. n. 1.). And grant again; that, about some 140. years after Christ, *i. e.* about some 40. years after the decease of all the Apostles, the same superior Government of one Presbyter (called Bishop) over the rest is reviv'd, and appears to be used in the Church (see §. 75. n. 2.). So that the main dispute is reduced only to the time of these 40. or 50. years; Whether within that space, after that the Authority (which they call extraordinary) of *Timothy* and *Titus*, *James*, and *Mark*, and such like other Apostolical delegates, was expired, the Government of the Church was not Presbyterial, and without Bishops. This contest, I say, is held on foot by them, if S. *Ignatius* his Epistles may be allowed, to them, to be spurious. But, if these prove genuine (of which see before §. 44. n. 2.) then the Presbyterial Government, for the space of these forty or fifty years also, even themselves being Judges, remains exploded; for they confess those Epistles to give clear testimony for the Prelacy of Bishops above Presbyters. (see *Jus divin. Append.* p. 110. ——second Paper in the Isle of *Wight* p. 36.——*Walo Mess.* c. 4.

§. 97. 'And thus the case stands, if we look into the 'Concessions of the English Presbyterians; but if we 'examine those of some others of their Sect, that are 'mentioned before, *Salmasius*, *Moulin*, *Chamier*. The 'first of these saith.——*Rem esse antiquissimam, ut duo hi 'ordines in Ecclesiâ fuerint distincti, Episcoporum & 'Presbyterorum, si excipiantur Apostolica tempora* (see 'before §. 75. n. 5.). The second.——That *Ordo 'Episcopalis* is *juris Apostolici*——and that——*quomodo-'cunque appellaverimus* Titum, Timotheum, & Mar-'cum, *seu Episcopos, seu Evangelistas; constare, eos ha-'buisse successores Episcopos, hæredes illius præeminentiæ*: 'Only,——that *multa sunt ab Apostolis statuta circa*

'*politiam*

politiam Eccleſiaſticam, quæ non ſunt juris divini.—— and, in his, *eos ſuâ prudentiâ ſæpè uſos fuiſſe.* From whence he gathers a lawfull power in his (or a particular,) Church to abrogate or change theſe (ſee before §. 78.). The third, to the authorities urged by *Bellarmine*, anſwers thus —— *Horum authoritates oſtendunt inæqualitatem* [Epiſcoporum & Presbyterorum] *eſſe vetuſtiſſimam, ac vicinam Apoſtolorum temporibus, Quod nos ultrò fatemur.* And—*Quam* [innovationem] *conjicere licet factam aut nondum elapſo, aut vix elapſo primo ſæculo.* —— But, to return again to our own Men.]

§. 98. Again; for theſe forty or fifty years, they confeſs: that there was not an equal parity amongſt the Presbyters: but that there was a *primus Presbyter*, or *Epiſcopus Præſes*, that (as a Moderator in a Church-aſſembly, or a Speaker in a Parliament) governed *communi conſilio Presbyterorum.* (See before §. 80.) (And this he did not for a ſeaſon, but the ſame perſon for his whole Life, as they cannot deny, if they will not go againſt all faith of Hiſtory). Thus our Engliſh.

§. 99. [But *Blondel*, whom they ſeem to take for their guide in Antiquity, expreſſeth himſelf ſomewhat more fully.——*Ubicunque, primùm naſcente Chriſtianiſmo, Presbyterorum collegium aggregari cœpit, antiquiſſimo inter Collegas primatum contigiſſe, ut conſeſſus totius caput, fratrumque tandem προεδρῶς fieret; ad hos Presbyteriorum præpoſitos confluxiſſe, ex communi collegarum conſenſu, primam cujuſque Eccleſiæ curam.*—— *& iis, ceu ἐξάρχοις, commiſſi gregis tam* Καταρθώματα, *quàm pudenda ex æquo, à Domino ipſo Eccleſiarum Aſiaticarum Angelos ad fidei conſtantiam cœleſtibus monitis armante, imputata eſſe.*——*Atque hanc Eccleſiaſticæ politiæ formam, illum liberè credere, ab initio obſervatam, Chriſtianiſque traditam ſive ab Apoſtolis, ſive ab eorum diſcipulis, ſed ut mutabilem pro uſu & arbitrio Eccleſiæ.*——Again; *in gratiam primi Presbyteri tituli Epiſcopalis reſervationem ſenſim factam eſſe*——and that for this place it was, that *Diotrephes* (φιλοπρωτεύων) raiſed ſuch ſtirs in S. *John*'s time: and *Thebuthus* and others,

'not long after. See more of this, before §. 79. n. 1. 'and especially what he saith there. —— *Ex quo quadam 'Episcopis illis assignata est super consortes ὑφοχὴ* (as, he 'said but now, it was in the very Apostle's times), *ne- 'cesse fuisse, ut Clericorum quorumcunque ordinationibus 'præessent; qui electos consuetâ manus impositione, mysticâ- 'que prece consecrare* soli *debuerunt; non alii, quos secun- 'das in Ecclesiæ ministerio partes obire consuetudo voluerat.* 'And, of the same ancient prime Presbyters, thus saith 'Chamier. —— *Accipere* [eos] *novam potestatem, ju- 'risdictionemque non iverim inficias; ut ne esset Episcopatus 'merus titulus. Ac sanè, cùm quis esset tantùm Presbyter, 'non fit verisimile eum habuisse in suos Collegas, aut in uni- 'versam Ecclesiam jurisdictionem, sed tantùm cum fiebat 'primus*, i. e. *Episcopus.* Thus he. (See before §. 76. n. 3.). 'And lastly *Calvin* himself upon *Tit.* 1. 5. hath this ob- 'servation of the same Church-Ministers in the Apo- 'stle's times. —— *Non eam fuisse tunc æqualitatem inter Ec- 'clesiæ ministros, quin unus aliquis authoritate & consilio 'præesset.* (See before §. 77.). And what authority can 'he mean but *Titus*'s? else he forsakes the Text from 'which he raiseth his note. At least therefore, ac- 'cording to these men, some superior, not only presi- 'dency, but authority, from the very beginning, amongst 'the Clergy one single Person had; though they will 'not come up perfectly to acknowledge it the same with 'that of modern Bishops.]

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

§. 100. And some other Concessions (to remove bye-quarrels) made to them. 1.

HAving presented You this short review of their Concessions; to lop off all superfluous Quarrels, and wave such Controversies, as serve only to accumulate more advantages to a side, than it hath need of, let these things, on the other side, be conceded unto them. 1. That, though in the very first times the Offices and Functions of Prelate-Bishops and Presbyters were distinct; yet were they not then, always, distinguished by those Titles, by which they are now: both Presbyters being divers times called Bishops in the Holy Scriptures; and Bishops also being called and comprehended under the name of *Presbyters* or *Seniores*, in those latter Ages, wherein the distinction of their Functions is undisputable; as *Blondel* and others (I know not to what purpose, since they grant in those times, a superior Authority of these Prelates) have taken much pains, out of *Irenæus*, and other Ancients, to prove. [Indeed the word *Presbyter*, or *Senior*, was a general and common name (borrowed from the former Church of the *Jews*) given to all Ecclesiastical Governours, and applied sometimes, even to the Apostles (1 *Pet.* 5. 1.—2 *John* 1.) and to that supream Consistory in the heavenly Temple (*Rev.* 4. 10.): And therefore, in the Apostle's numbring up the several orders of Church-men, *Some Apostles, some Prophets, &c*, he saith not in any of those places, *and some Presbyters*]. But, the diversity of the *Ordination* and *Function* of these Church-Officers (usually distinguished in later times by the names of Bishops and Presbyters) appearing then; what, or whether they had then any, diversity of *names*, (save some ordinary Epithete denoting superiority, which might be added to the word Presbyter or Bishop;) it mattereth not. [Some think, that

theſe Superiors, at the firſt, were uſually called by the name of *Apoſtles*; finding this name, in the New Teſtament, given to ſeveral, beſides the Twelve: (See 2 *Cor.* 8. 23.—*Rom.* 16. 7. *Acts*, 14. 4, 14.—*Rev.* 2. 2. —*Phil.* 2. 25. On which place thus *Theodoret.*—— Epaphroditum *vocavit Apoſtolum,*——*ut clarum ſit ſub eo fuiſſe eos, qui in principio dicti ſunt Epiſcopi, utpote qui Presbyterorum locum tenerent.* *Epaphroditus*, then, ſtiled *Apoſtle*, it ſeems, to diſtinguiſh him from the Presbyters under him, then called Biſhops: So, the ſame *Theodoret* (on 1 *Tim.* 3. 1.) calls *Timothy* Apoſtle of the *Aſians*, and *Titus* Apoſtle of the *Cretians*: *Epiphanius* (*Hær.* 51.) calls *Luke* and *Mark* ſo: *Clemens Alexand.* (*Strom.* 4.) calls the *Roman* Biſhop *Clement* ſo: *Chryſoſtom* (*Hom. in* S. *Ignat. Mart.*) calls Biſhop *Ignatius* ſo); till, the name of *Biſhop* being appropriated to the Superiors, this former Title of *Apoſtle*, out of reverence to thoſe former Church-Governours, whom their Succeſſors did not equal in variety of ſpiritual Gifts, and miraculous effects, was laid aſide.] But yet you may obſerve; concerning theſe Titles alſo of Biſhop and Presbyter; that, in the Writings of the next Age after the Apoſtles, though the Biſhops were ſtill ſometimes called *Seniores* or *Presbyteri*; yet, 1. So were not the Presbyters then called *Epiſcopi*, (if we except only the firſt writing extant after the Apoſtles, the Epiſtle of *Clemens Romanus* to the *Corinthians*; who yet more uſually expreſſeth theſe two Dignities by the name *Presbyter*), this term of Biſhop beginning then to be appropriated only to that higher rank of Presbyters, who ſucceeded to the Apoſtles in their plenary Power: and 2. neither then were the Biſhops called Presbyters, ordinarily, but with ſome note of diſtinction from the reſt; as *Presbyter Eccleſiæ Romanæ* (when they ſpoke of the Biſhop of *Rome*) *Presbyter* or *Senior*, *qui præeſt*, *qui præſidet*, *præpoſitus*, *gubernans*, *&c.*

V. *Theodoret* in 1 *Tim.* 3. 1.

V. *Amalar. de Eccleſiaſt. offic.* l. 2. c. 13.

2. Again,

2. Again, let it be conceded; that all, that enter into the ſacred Order of Prieſthood, have ſome charge of Chriſt's Flock, and ſome government of the Church committed unto them, as well as Biſhops ‖; though in Subordination to them, and dependance on their Licence for the exerciſe of this Power (received in Ordination) upon ſuch and ſuch Subjects: (ſee before §. 63. *n.* 1.) (yet not ſuch a dependance this neither, but that many of thoſe acts become valid, when done; though done without licence). So, the Presbyters do teach, exhort, rebuke, catechize, examine men's Conſciences, take Confeſſions, do bind and impoſe Penitences and ſatisfactions, ſuſpend from Abſolution, and the Sacraments, abſolve and reconcile Penitents, and thus exerciſe a ſupreme Juriſdiction of binding and looſing, accountable to none but God, in *foro interno*, or *conſcientiæ*, though not in *foro externo* or *contentioſo*, which belongs to the Biſhop. Of which Authority of Presbyters thus, long ago, Biſhop *Hall*, not willing to travel with his Adverſaries into by-Controverſies, (Defence of Remonſt. §. 9.).——*Whoever challenged (in that ſenſe which you feign to your ſelves) ſole Jurisdiction? Why will you confute, what you yield us to confeſs? We do willingly grant;* * *that Presbyters have, and ought to have, and exerciſe, a jurisdiction within their own charge in* foro conſcientiæ: * *That, in all great Affairs of the Church the Presbyters, whether in Synod or otherwiſe, ought to be conſulted with:* * *That the Biſhops had of old their Eccleſiaſtical Council of Presbyters, with whoſe advice they were wont to manage the greateſt matters; and we ſtill have ſo. For to that purpoſe ſerve the Deans and Chapters; and the Laws of our Church frequently make that uſe of them. We grant, that Presbyters have their Votes in Provincial Synods: but we juſtly ſay, that the ſuperiority of Jurisdiction is ſo in the Biſhop, as that the Presbyters neither did, nor may, exerciſe it without him: and that the exerciſe of external jurisdiction is derived from, by, under, him to thoſe, who execute it within his Dioceſe.* Thus he. And hence perhaps it is, that S. *Ignatius*, in ſaluting

§. 101. *n.* 1. 2.

‖ *See* Spalat. *de Rep. Eccleſ. l.* 5. *c.* 12. *n.* 25.

luting the Clergy of those Churches he writes to, useth frequently the word πρεσβυτέριον, as well as πρεσβυτέρους. [Ep. ad *Smyrneos*——*saluto* τ̀ ἀξιόθεον, Ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ θεοπρεπέστατον πρεσβυτέριον, καὶ τοὺς συνδούλους μου Διακόνους Ep. ad *Philadelph*: ——*Unus Episcopus cum Presbyterio & Diaconis.* ——and so often in his other Epistles.] Looking upon them as an united Body; together with, but under, the Bishop, managing the Church. And hence are the Presbyters frequently stiled in Antiquity, *Præsidentes, præpositi*, &c; *i. e.* in respect of the Church, or *cœtus fidelium*; but Bishops, such, both in respect of the Church, and of Presbyters; they *Episcopi gregis*, these *Gregis & Pastorum.* And, by reason of this Government of the Church belonging to them both, let it be granted: that it was not an unusual distinction, amongst the first Ecclesiastical Writers (which *Blondel* hath copiously shewed out of them) of the higher Clergy, into *Sacerdotes* (or *Præpositi*), and *Diaconi*: the former terms being divided again into these two Members; *Episcopi & Presbyteri in their modern acception*; as appeareth in the same Authors. And, according to this; let the Deacon be conceived to stand at a much greater distance from the Presbyter; than the Presbyter from the Bishop: which Deacons anciently ‖ might not sit down in the presence of a Presbyter without his leave; but the Presbyters had their *Cathedra*'s, and sate with the Bishop. Therefore are they also called by S. *Ignatius*, *Ep. ad Magnes.*——Corona *Presbyterii*, [The Seats being placed in manner of a Semicircle, ‖ inclosing the Altar, and the middle Chair being the Bishop's, as they are described in ancient Authors, and are yet to be seen in some ancient Churches]. ——And again he saith in the same Epistle.—— *In concordiâ Dei studete omnia operari, Præsidente Episcopo in loco Dei, & Presbyteris in loco συνεδρίου, Consessionis*, or *Concilii Apostolorum.* So they are also called in the ‖ *Apostolical Constitutions*, *Consiliarii Episcopi*; & *Consilium, Senatus, & corona Ecclesiæ.*

‖ *See Conc. Carth. l. 4. c. 34, 39. Conc. Laodic. c. 20.*

‖ V. *Apost. Constit. l. 2. c. 57. Euseb. Hist. l. 10. c. 4.*

‖ *l. 2. c. 28.*

And

And here alſo, as to the Diſpute, whether Presbyters and Biſhops be *diverſi Ordines Eccleſiaſtici*, or rather *eiuſdem Ordinis diverſi gradus*; if to any there doth not ſeem as much reaſon (ſetting aſide the notion, which ſome run upon, with relation to the Euchariſt) to diverſifie the Order of Biſhops from that of Presbyters, becauſe the Biſhop hath the Office of conferring Orders, which the Presbyter hath not; as, to diverſifie the Office of a *Lector* from an *Oſtiarius*; becauſe the one hath the Office of publick reading or ſinging in the Church, which the other hath not: Or, of an *Acolythus* from a *Lector*; becauſe the one officiates in the Preparations to the Euchariſt, which the other may not; I ſay, if different Functions may not diſtinguiſh theſe higher Orders, as they do the lower, let this Controverſie be ſtated, as any one pleaſeth; (Only,) ſo that the Biſhops be ſtill acknowledged, * to have been admitted to this *ſuperior gradus*, by a new Ordination or Conſecration (call it, as you pleaſe), even in the moſt ancient Records of the Church, (of which ſee before Sect. 42. n. 2.) and, by this, * to have committed to them thoſe ſpecial Acts, or Act Eccleſiaſtical, which if the *inferior gradus* Sacerdotal did aſſume, it was always accounted by the Church invalid, null, and effectleſs; (as hath been ſhewed before Sect. 69. n. 7, &c.). §. 101. *n.* 2.

3. Let it be conceded likewiſe; that Presbyters were joined alſo with the Biſhop in ſeveral Acts of this Eccleſiaſtical Government, as his Aſſiſtants, Aſſeſſors, Council, and Fellow-voters in *Dioceſan* Synods; ſo that theſe Acts were not ordinarily tranſacted by the Biſhop without the knowledge and conſent of his Colledge of Presbyters, I mean the Presbyters reſident in that City, where he is Biſhop; (of which, ſee what is conceded before, §. 69. n. 2.). For this is willingly confeſſed to have been both anciently obſerved, at leaſt in ſome Churches, and times; and alſo enjoined. (See 4. *Conc. Carth. can.* 2. 20.——S. *Ignatius* Ep. *ad Trall.*——S. *Cyprian*, Ep. 6. 18. 28. 35.——*Cornel.* his Ep. *apud Euſeb.* §. 102. *n.* 1.

Euseb. l. 6. c. 42. and Ep. 46. *apud Cyprian*) concerning which matter, as to the chief Episcopal Act, Ordination, in the English Church, thus Bishop *Hall* in answer to the Presbyterian Party *A. D.* 1641. (Defence of Remonstr. p. 70.) ——*Our Bishops did never challenge Ordination as theirs, alone, without the Presbyters: but as, principally, theirs, with them: so, as if the power be in the Bishop, the assistance is in them; the practice in both. So is it in the Bishops, that ordinarily, and regularly, it may not be done without the Presbyters.* —— and p. 131. *Whereas you still talk of sole Ordination and sole Jurisdiction.* ——*We contend not for such an height of propriety, neither do we practise it: they are so ours, that they should not be without us, as we have formerly shewed.* Thus he. And thus much *Dr.* Hammond ‖ *upon the* 2 Can. *of* 4. Conc. Carthag.——*This Canon is a Testimony for the fitness and usefulness of that custom still retained, and used in our Church in all Ordinations of Presbyters, and Deacons; That the Presbyters present should lay on their hands by the hand of the Bishop, and so join in the Prayer of Benediction.* Let this therefore, I say, be granted to them.

‖ Vindic. of Differt. concerning Episcopacy, p. 186

§ 102. *n.* 2.

1. Provided first; that such Arguments, touching Bishop's not governing without their Presbytery in former times, have no more force now for equalling Bishops with Presbyters, than they had, then; I mean in the days of *Cyprian*, and of other ancient Bishops, in which days we find an Episcopal Authority, (notwithstanding this), superior in the same kinds, as is the modern.

§. 102. *n.* 3.

2. 2ly. Provided; that this right be still preserved to the Prelates, that μηδὲν χωρὶς τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου (as S. *Ignatius* ‖ enjoins) that nothing be done by the Presbyters, without the Bishop: and, if nothing without him, then especially not these two. Not sacred Orders conferred, nor Church-censures inflicted, without him; and if these not without him; then cannot the Presbytery, when separated from their Bishop, lawfully ordain, or censure; and then (as Dr. *Hammond* prosecutes this matter. (*Vindic.* p. 164.) *there will be little shew of the Presbyterian model discernable; viz. no more, than there was in* England, *before they*

‖ Ep. *ad Smyrn. ad Philadel. & ad Trall.*

they covenanted to caſt the Biſhops out of the Church: It being certain, that no community or equality of Presbyters, taken into Council with the Biſhop, doth conſtitute the Government Presbyterian; as long as there is any Biſhop [thus] *to have power over them: Elſe had the Convocation of Deans, Archdeacons, and Clerks, 1640. been the platform of Presbyterian Government in* England. Thus he.

And, 3ly. Provided; that there be affirmed no abſolute neceſſity of ſuch concurrence of the Presbytery, eſpecially as to Ordination, that Presbyters muſt either lay on hands, or joyn in the Benediction, to render it either valid, or, in every Church, regular; (of which ſee before §. 65. n. 2. &c.). Since *Blondel* upon the weighing of ſome ancient Canons concedeth a ſole Ordination by Biſhops to have been, for ſome Churches and times; and only contends; *non, ubique, Epiſcopum ſolum manus ordinandis, ex officio, impoſuiſſe*: (See before Sect. 65. n. 4.) and granteth (ſee before Sect. 65. n. 5.), that one ſingle Presbyter's laying on hands, (the reſt aſſenting), in Ordination is ſufficient; ſo therefore is the Biſhop's; a Presbyter, and more. And hence, if a Biſhop, together with ſome Presbyters laying on hands with him, ſhould ordain a Biſhop, it muſt be conceded valid; ſince, when a Biſhop layeth on hands alone, it is ſo. §. 102. *n.* 4. 3.

4ly. It ſhall not be brought here into diſpute; whether the Apoſtles, (for decency of order, the more reverence of Holy Duties, and preventing of Schiſms), did not reſtrain the exerciſe of ſome Functions to certain of the Presbyters exalted above the reſt, which Functions our Saviour left common to all. —Nor likewiſe; whether ſome, not only Eccleſiaſtical, but Apoſtolical Conſtitutions are not, in neceſſary and extraordinary caſes, and in a great diſparity of times and manners, diſpenſable-with, or alterable by, the ſupream Governors of the Church. ‖ §. 103. *n.* 1. 4. ‖ *V.* before Sect. 61. n. 5.

Only it is deſired. Firſt; that the Apoſtolical Succeſſion, in that which was our Saviour's Inſtitution, §. 103. *n.* 2. 1.

may not be ſtiled Apoſtolical Conſtitution: I mean, * that thoſe Perſons, who were left and ordained their Succeſſors by the Apoſtles in thoſe Offices, which were conferred, only on the Apoſtles, by our Lord, may not therefore be ſaid to be *conſtituted* only by the Apoſtles in thoſe Offices, wherein they *ſucceded* them: Or * that, whilſt the Apoſtles conſtitute ſuch a Perſon in ſuch Offices, therefore they may not be ſaid to conſtitute ſuch Offices *de novo* for thoſe Perſons.

§. 103. *n.* 3. 2. And 2ly. That, when a particular Perſon or Church judgeth that there is a neceſſity of changing ſome Apoſtolical Conſtitution, whilſt the Church univerſal judgeth there is none, neither in reſpect of the whole, nor of that part, then the particular Perſon, or Church, may not abrogate it; ſo long as the Church univerſal ſtill thinketh meet, or alſo neceſſary, to retain it. For, if the part be tied by the whole, in Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, (ſee below Sect. 177.) much more in Apoſtolical.

§. 104. *n.* 1. 5. 5ly. To go ſomewhat higher, let this *jus divinum* of ſacred Orders be underſtood, (by our Saviour's, or his Apoſtle's intention), not to tye the moſt proper and diſtinctive acts of them, ſo cloſe and inſeparably only to thoſe Perſons, who have received ſuch Orders; but that the exerciſe of ſome of them at leaſt (ſuch as are of more neceſſity, for the People, or of leſs Dignity in themſelves) may, in ſome extraordinary caſe, by the Diſpenſation of the Church, or the chiefeſt Officers thereof, be delegated and committed to ſome other Perſon void of thoſe Orders. Only provided; That the *jus divinum*, and that common rule grounded upon it, *ea quæ pendent ex poteſtate Ordinis non poſſe delegari*, be underſtood always to extend thus far, As, that the common and ordinary Adminiſtration of ſuch Acts doth belong only to thoſe, who have received the Order; and cannot, by any Diſpenſation, be communicated to others void of it.

§. 104. *n.* 2. ‘ [For you muſt know that, of Eccleſiaſtical Fun-
‘ ctions, (according to the Church's Practice; and ac-
‘ cording

cording as ſhe apprehendeth, what our Saviour and his Apoſtles have inſtituted as neceſſary, and what again they have left to her free diſpoſal); that of Eccleſiaſtical Functions (I ſay) ſome there are, of which though the power be proper and intrinſecal to an Order, yet the exerciſe of ſuch Functions, for *the place and ſubject*, is conferred and received from the Licence and Authority of a Superior. Thus the exerciſe of all the moſt proper Functions belonging to the Presbyter, as preaching, and adminiſtring the Sacraments, is delegated and committed to him by the Biſhop; who hath the chief Charge, and Juriſdiction over that part of the Church Catholick (where the Presbyter is left reſident) by a continued Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, and therefore is ſtiled, ordinarily in Antiquity, the *Paſtor* thereof; ‖ and ſo, by reaſon of this Juriſdiction the Presbyter can have, no where, any Subjects of his own, any matter to work upon, but by this Truſt and Delegation. And therefore he was anciently, as it were, one of the Biſhop's Family, and from him, not the People, received his ſtipend; and hence alſo, after ſuch licence obtained, a Presbyter might not, in the Biſhop's preſence, exerciſe theſe Functions, unleſs by his Order, ‖ but leave the performance of them to this chief Paſtor, *ad quem omnis Eccleſiæ cura pertinebat*, as S. *Jerom.* See what is ſaid before of this matter. Sect. 63. *n.* 1.

‖ *See* B. Andrew's *1ſt. and 3d. anſwer to* Du. Moulin.

‖ V. *before Sect.* 76. n. 2.

2. Again; ſome Eccleſiaſtical Functions there are of which, though the power doth primarily and originally belong to one Order, yet the exerciſe thereof may be delegated to another Order, inferior, or alſo to thoſe of no ſacred Order at all. And theſe Functions are of two ſorts. Either ſuch, as are of a more ordinary Delegation. As *preaching* and *baptizing*: which though primarily and properly they belong only to the Orders of *Presbyters* and *Biſhops*, yet, being ſo neceſſary to Chriſtianity, are uſually ▵ delegated to *Deacons*, to exerciſe them chiefly in the Biſhop's, or

§. 104. *n.* 3.

2.

1.

'Presbyter's, abſence; or, in his preſence, by his 'leave. A pattern of which we find in the Scriptures 'themſelves; where, though the Commiſſion, *Go 'and teach all Nations baptizing them*, Mat. 28. 19. is 'made by our Saviour to the Apoſtles; yet, by dele-'gation from them (without offending therein againſt 'our Saviour's Inſtitution) *Stephen* and *Philip* Deacons 'both baptized and preached; So, *Ananias* (*Act.* 9. 18.) 'and thoſe Brethren with *Peter* (*Act.* 10. 48.) baptized: 'and ſee, *Act.* 2. 41. three thouſand Souls baptized at 'one time, which required no ſmall number of Baptizers. 'And ſo the Apoſtles themſelves, before they were 'made Prieſts, by our Saviour's Delegation both baptized '(*Joh.* 4. 2.); and preached (*Mat.* 10. 7.). △ Again, 'theſe two Delegated alſo, (but this more extraordi-'nary, in ſome caſes of exigency) to thoſe void of all 'ſacred Orders: * the power of baptizing, in caſe of 'neceſſity, and by reaſon of the facility of an unerring 'miniſtration of this Sacrament, is permitted even to 'Laicks: and * ſo preaching alſo, in ancient times, by 'the Biſhop's Licence, is found ſometimes permitted to 'the Learned, though yet Laicks. *Origen*, when yet a 'Laick, was permitted it by the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, 'and the Biſhop of *Cæſarea*; which Biſhops, being que-'ſtioned for it by *Demetrius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, *Ori-'gen*'s *Dioceſan* (but chiefly, that he ſhould do this, the
|| Euſeb. *l.* 6. *c.* 19. 'Biſhops being preſent) || *Quod nunquam ſit auditum, quòd 'Laici præſentibus Epiſcopis in Eccleſiâ docuerint*, do thus 'juſtifie themſelves. ——*Reperiuntur, qui, cùm inſtructi 'eſſent ad commodandum fratribus, & ſancti Epiſcopi ad-'hortarentur ut populum docerent, ad hunc modum in Ec-'cleſiâ docuerint*: giving theſe examples. *Quemadmo-'dum* Larandis, Euelpis, *à* Neone *rogatus*; *&* Iconii, 'Paulinus *à* Celſo; *&* Synodis, Theodorus *ab* Attico, '*beatis ſcilicet fratribus* [*i. e.* Biſhops]. Agreeable with 'which is that Canon 98. of the 4. *Conc. Carthag.*—— '*Laicus præſentibus Clericis, niſi ipſis jubentibus, docere 'non audeat.* But, remember, this is permitted only

'to

to the Learned, with the Biſhop's Licence; elſe ſtrictly prohibited; ſee *Conc. Conſtant. in Trullo. can.* 64.

Or 2ly. ſuch Functions, as are of more extraordinary Delegation, when ſome exigency ſeemeth to require it. As not only ſeveral acts of Juriſdiction; (as the *power of excommunicating and abſolving in* foro exteriori, *ſeveral Conſecrations of Places, and Perſons,)* but alſo *Confirmation* and *conferring of the lower Clergy-Orders* (that of Sub-deacon, &c.) though proper to Biſhops, yet, by eſpecial Diſpenſation, many think, may be performed by a Presbyter: though in the modern *Greek* Church the *Ordinary* Miniſter alſo of Confirmation is the Baptizer, though a Presbyter. (ſee before §. 68. *n.* 4.). 2.

3ly. Other Functions there be, which, by Chriſt and his Apoſtle's primitive Inſtitution, do ſo ſpecially diſtinguiſh the Orders, as that they are utterly uncommunicable, either by ordinary or extraordinary Diſpenſation, to another Order. As, *Conſecration of the Euchariſt, and Ligation, and Abſolution, or Reconciliation of Penitents in* foro conſcientiæ, do belong ſo to the Sacerdotal Office, as that they are, by no Diſpenſation of the Church communicable to Deacons, or any *non-Prieſt*: And again, *Ordination of Biſhops and Prieſts* belongs ſo to the Epiſcopal Office, as that it is, by no Eccleſiaſtical Diſpenſation, communicable to Presbyters or other *non-Biſhops*; Nor yet *Confirmation* communicable to any *non-Prieſt*. And the beſt judge and guide, that I know, in this ſubtle diſtinction of Eccleſiaſtical Faculties conferred, on the ſame Perſon, at the ſame time, with the ſame words, to diſcover to us, what Faculties of theſe are annexed to ſuch an Order, *Jure Divino*, or *Jure Eccleſiaſtico*; or what are annexed *jure Divino*, with a permiſſion to the Church to diſpenſe in ſome caſes; or with a reſtraint in no caſe to diſpenſe therewith; I ſay, the beſt guide herein, that I know, is the Church's Practice; which I have endeavoured to ſhew you in the former part of §. 104. *n.* 4. 3.

'of this Discourse; to which he that conforms, is 'safe.

§. 104. n. 5. 'Of these Episcopal and Sacerdotal Acts, you may 'note also; that no Suspension, or Prohibition from 'any Superior can render them, whenever done by 'the Bishop, or Priest, to be unvalid according to the 'common Doctrine of the Church, excepting only *Ab-* '*solution*; which being not only a declarative, or pure- 'ly ministerial, but also a judicial, Act, it is accounted 'utterly un-effectual, so often as it is performed by a 'Priest toward those, over whom his Superiors have gi- 'ven him no Jurisdiction, either none in general; or 'none, for some more grievous sins, when these Supe- 'riors, for greater terror, and for the scandal given, 'reserve such a Jurisdiction to themselves. And in- 'deed, if not in respect of the giver, yet in respect of 'the receiver, such Absolution must needs be invalid to 'so many as know, or may know, him, to whom they 'repair for Absolution, to be an unlicensed Person, 'whether for Schism, Heresie, or any other cause. 'For, they are never rightly disposed for obtaining re- 'mission of Sin, who commit a sin to obtain it: *i.e.* who 'disobey the Church's commands in repairing to a pro- 'hibited Person. There is no universal Penitence, 'where such a known fault is committed and unre- 'pented of: and so, no effectual Absolution. And the 'same may be said both of Baptism, and the Eucha- 'rist; that they are unbeneficial, for remission of sin, 'or conferring grace, to those, who knowingly re- 'ceive them from a prohibited Person; at least 'where there is a power of receiving them from 'others.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Particular Rep'ls to their Objections.

§. 105.

R. to their Objections out of the Scriptures.

R. to *a.*

THeſe Conceſſions having removed ſome by-quarrels out of the way; this briefly may be returned (in order as they lye) to their ſeveral Objections.

To *a. Sect.* 82. That the Names of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* do ſometimes in Scripture denote the ſame Office in the Church, namely that of Presbyters, is granted. (See *Conceſſion* 1. *Sect.* 100.). But, that the Office of theſe Presbyters, who are ſuppoſed here ſometimes in Scripture to have the name of Biſhops, is, or was, then, to ordain Elders, or exerciſe Juriſdiction *in foro externo*, as thoſe do, who now have this name of *Biſhops*, is denied. As likewiſe; that there is no ſuch Officer in the Church ordained by Chriſt; (or by his Apoſtles, who had the Spirit of Chriſt; either of which is enough to eſtabliſh ſuch Office; and the Presbyterians themſelves ſay *that* Apoſtolical, *is with them all one with* Divine *Inſtitution* ‖) as a Biſhop over Presbyters, *i. e.* ſuch, as hath power to ordain and exerciſe juriſdiction over Presbyters, this alſo is denied. Nay, the contrary thereof, namely, that ſuch an Office over Presbyters is in the Scriptures committed by the Apoſtle to *Timothy* and *Titus* is affirmed by the Presbyterians themſelves; who therefore call *Timothy* and *Titus* Officers *extraordinary*. Neither do the Texts produced by the Presbyterians prove what here they pretend; as will appear in the anſwers returned to them. As for what names in Scripture do diſtinguiſh theſe ſuperior Church-Officers from common Presbyters, it mattereth not. Since they give the name of *Evangeliſt* to *Timothy* and *Titus*; let theſe Superiors be called ſo, if they pleaſe; or alſo let them be called *Apoſtles*; for ſo they were called ſometimes (ſee *Phil.* 2. 25. —2 *Cor.* 8. 23. —*Rom.* 16. 7. *Theodoret* in *Phil.*

‖ *V.* ſecond paper in the Iſle of *Wight*, *Oct.* 17. p. 6.

See Sect. 73. n. 1.

Phil. 1. 1.) ſo long as they diſcharged their Office in many Churches, or Provinces; afterward, when, upon more plenty of like Governors ordained, the exerciſe of their Function was appropriated to one Church, or Province, let them be called *primi*, or *ſummi*, or *Præſidentes Presbyteri*; and laſtly, κατ' ἐξοχὴν *Epiſcopi*; yet remember that by this laſt name they were diſtinctively called as early, as S. *Ignatius*.

§. 106. To *c*. What is urged, (namely, that Presbyters are called Biſhops, and that the qualities of a *Presbyter* are there deſcribed) let it be granted, (ſee *Conceſſion* 1.): Yet were *Timothy* and *Titus* conſtituted the ſuperior Governors to ſuch *Biſhops*, *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum*. (See before *Sect.* 73. *n.* 1.).

R. to *c*.

§. 107. To *γ*. [1] There might be ſome Biſhops of the *Aſian* Cities near adjoining mingled with the Elders of *Epheſus*, and with *Timothy* their Biſhop, and to them all in general might the Apoſtle make this ſpeech. *Irenæus* favours this conjecture l. 3. c. 14. —— *In Mileto* (ſaith he) *convocatis Epiſcopis & Presbyteris, qui erant, ab* Epheſo *& à reliquis proximis civitatibus* [Paulus] *multa teſtificans*, &c. He ſaith, *Epiſcopis & Presbyteris*, not *Epiſcopis ſive Presbyteris*. But to let this paſs; [2] Presbyters are Church-Governors in ſome ſence, as well as Biſhops (ſee *Conceſſ.* 2. §. 101. n. 1.) and ſo capable of ſuch a charge. [3] The Commiſſions, which the Apoſtle gave before to *Timothy*, and now to them, croſs not. [4] Whether *Timothy* was preſent at *Miletum*, is uncertain. If preſent; for any thing that appeareth from the Text, he might then receive his charge alſo, as well as they, theirs. Eſpecially, he (probably) being, then, left there behind with the *Epheſians*: For we find not, that he accompanied the Apoſtle any further, than only into *Aſia* (*Act.* 20. 4.) [5] From the Apoſtle's not being ſaid here to mention any thing of *Timothy*, or his ſuperintendency over the *Aſian* Presbytery, it will not follow, that there was no ſuch thing: All that is true is not every where ſaid:

R. to *γ*.

nor

nor all, that is any where ſaid by the Apoſtle, rehearſed by the Hiſtorian: thus themſelves anſwer where need is, ſee *Jus divin. Miniſt. Evang.* p. 177. [6] But we may certainly know, that *Timothy*'s former Authority over theſe Presbyters was not, before, or by, this *Miletum* meeting, reverſed or expired, from the Apoſtle's reiterating to him, with relation to the ſame Perſons, the ſame charge and rules of Government in his ſecond Epiſtle ſent to him from *Rome* long after this meeting. Of which ſee more below. §. 119.

To ℵ¹. [1] It is not neceſſary, that what S. *Peter* ſpeaketh there, he ſhould ſpeak to the ſupremeſt (but to the moſt numerous) rank of Church-men: and inferior Church-men alſo are ὑπερκοπτοντες ‖ over God's People, in the Scriptures dilated ſenſe of this word (ſee *Conceſſ.* 1.), and in their Government may Lord it too much (witneſs *Diotrephes*), as well as Superiors. [2] Yet probable; that, here, under the general name of Presbyters, or Seniors, the ſuperior Church-Officers were alſo included; or, perhaps thoſe only (there) intended to be ſpoken to: For, if theſe were called Presbyters long after in *Irenæus* his time, When the Offices are granted to be diſtinct; why not in S. *Peter*'s alſo? and κατακυριευοντες τῶν κλήρων rendred by the Vulgar, *dominantes in cleris*, much favours this Interpretation; whether you take κλῆρος here, for Clergy; Or, for a diſtinct portion of Chriſtians allotted to the Charge of ſuch Governors. For ſingle Presbyters had not then, as now, every one a κλῆρος or a diſtinct Pariſh or Congregation of Chriſtians committed unto them: but Biſhops had.

§. 108. *n.* 1. R. to ℵ¹. ‖ *Conceſſ.* 2. *Sect.* 101.

To ℵ². This arguing which they ſo frequently uſe, to the wonder of the other Party, namely this: [It is the Office of a Biſhop to ordain; but Presbyters are commanded to do the Office of a Biſhop, therefore to ordain; which is a clear non-conſequence, as you may ſee, if you put the word *Clergy-man* inſtead of the word *Biſhop*] is a trivial equivocation (long complained of,

§. 108. *n.* 2. R. to ℵ².

not yet laid aſide), in the word Biſhop: which is in Scripture ſometimes given to the inferior Church-Officers, who have no power of ordaining; though (ſince), this word is appropriated only to the Superiors, who have power of Ordaining. Their *Major* therefore, to inferr the Concluſion, ought to run thus. It is the Office of every one, that is in Scripture called a Biſhop, to ordain. But this Propoſition cannot be proved out of S. *Peter*'s words, or other Scriptures. Where [Biſhop] is uſed in Scripture to ſignifie Presbyter, the Office of a Biſhop is only the Office of a Presbyter; which Presbyter's Office can, neither in this nor any other Text, be ſhewed to have Ordination annexed to it, as *Timothy*'s, and *Titus*'s had. The like Argument they make *Jus Divin.* p. 51. Elders are Biſhops, but it belongs to Biſhops to ordain, therefore to Elders.

§. 109. R. to ε. To ε. Inferior Presbyters are not denied to be Church-Rulers, (v. §. 101. *n.* 1.) nor ſuperior, to be called Presbyters. (v. §. 100.).

§. 110. *n.* 1. R. to ζ¹. To ζ. Uncertain; whether any ſuperior Biſhop was made as yet at *Corinth*: and, under the Apoſtle, as yet their ſupream Church-Governor, ſingle Presbyters may have Licence and Authority by a Juriſdiction delegated from him, in his neceſſary abſence, (ſee 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4.) to excommunicate great Offenders, and may be peccant in their indulgence; though, in thoſe firſt beginnings, where was no aſſiſtance of the ſecular Power, little Diſcipline was exerciſed without the aſſent of the whole Chriſtian Aſſembly, who alſo are involved in the Apoſtle's [*yee*].

§. 110. *n.* 2. R. to ζ². To ζ². A Synod Provincial, conſiſting of ſeveral Biſhops; or a Synod *Dioceſan*, conſiſting of the Biſhop and the Presbytery, is properly ſpoken too, or ſpoken of (as it is in *Act.* 18. 17. compared with 18, 19, 20.) in the plural; and yet this doth not argue an equality and parity, in the Governors, or Members of ſuch Synod. (See *Act.* 15. 22, 28.).

§. 111. R. to η¹. To η. See what is ſaid before § 43. ¹ *Angel* to be a

a ſingle perſon, and a ſuperior, as to Preſidency, and ſome other acts, is conceded, by *Blondel*, (ſee before § 79. *n.* 1.) by *Beza*, and other Presbyterians (ſee the *King*'s third paper p. 20.), notwithſtanding this ὑμῖν. They, then, do ſay, ὑμῖν, to you Presbyters, and the Angel, your Preſident; we ſay; ὑμῖν to you Presbyters, and the Angel, your Biſhop. 2. Letters, directed to the head, many times contain matter belonging to the whole ſociety. — 3. Not — [*Angel*] but [Starre] is the repreſentative correſponding to [*candleſtick*]. And our Saviour expounds, * the Candleſtick to denote a complexe, the Church; * the Starre to denote a ſingle perſon, the Angel thereof.

To *n*2. See what is anſwered below to 7. §. 127.

To 8. 1 We may rightly judge and meaſure the conſtitution of the Church of *Philippi*, and the reſt which were of S. *Paul*'s founding (one uniforme to himſelf 1 *Cor.* 7. 17.) by that eminent one of *Epheſus*; and over this we know, a ſingle perſon (*Timothy*) was ſuperintendent. But he, who is reported by the Ancients to have been at that time the Biſhop of *Philippi*, viz. *Epaphroditus*, whom S. *Paul* alſo calls their Apoſtle, was then with S. *Paul*, and non-reſident, (ſee *Phil.* 2. 25.) by whom he ſent this Epiſtle to them. 2 But, ſuppoſe, ſuch perſon at home; yet in the word Biſhops, (as we have ſaid) are included and put together both the ſuperior and inferior Presbyters: both being the Church Governors, though not to the ſame extent of power; and Deacons being the Miniſters to both. And if they aſk, why no particular mention of ſo eminent a perſon as the Biſhop is, whom we put there? I ask, why no particular mention of the prime Presbyter, or Preſident, and Moderator of the Presbytery, that ſits in the Chair, (whom they allow to have been, then, in all Churches, and that during life), when as letters to any ſociety, or aſſembly do not uſe to paſs by ſuch a perſon in ſilence; nay are uſually directed to him; as, they ſay, our Saviour's Letter was *Rev.* 2. 1? 3 Again, I ask, why no particular mention of *Timothy*,

§. 112.

R. *to* 8.

in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, then Resident in *Asia*, and retaining the same superiority there, which another is affirmed to have had at *Philippi*, as it appeareth by the Apostle's second Epistle, written to him about the same time, as this Epistle was to *Ephesus?* (see 2 *Tim.* 4. 12. compared with *Eph.* 6. 21.) —— [4] But, though S. *Paul* take no notice of any single eminent person amongst the Presbyters of *Philippi* in his Epistle to the *Philipians*; yet he doth, in another Epistle, written about the same time, to the *Colossians*; giving a special charge to one single person, *Archippus*; (who is named by Antiquity to have been their first Bishop, and is called also by *Calvin* their Bishop, *Alibi Archippum Colossensium Episcopum commemorat*, *Instit. l.* 4. *c.* 3. §. 7.) *Col.* 4. 17. [*say to* Archippus, *take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it*; like that said to *Timothy* 2 Ep. 4. 5.]; Not mentioning the rest; though, doubtless, at *Colosse*, a chief City of *Phrygia*, was setled, before this, a Presbytery. And *Archippus* only, with one *Apphias*, again is mentioned in his Epistle to *Philemon*, (a rich Citizen of *Colosse*) sent at the same time with the other. Now, what preeminency *Archippus* had at *Colosse*, the same we may presume some other Clergy-man had at *Philippi*. [5] Nay, in this Epistle to the *Philippians*, though he taketh no notice of any single eminent person amongst the Clergy, in *chap.* 1. 1., Yet he doth in *chap.* 4. 3. and bespeaketh him, by the name of *Yoke-fellow*, to help his converts, the devout women, that assisted him there in his troubles (*Act.* 16. 13, 14. Which Yoke fellow some conceive to be *Epaphroditus*, whom he then sends thither: and, if it were not he, yet *Diodate* understands it to be the principal person amongst the Pastors —— *Parla al Principale d' infra I pastori.* As for the Question; why *Timothy* was sent to the *Philippians*, if there were already a Bishop established there? I ask again, why *Timothy* sent, if their Presbytery were established there? No Church, Presbytery, or Bishop, especially so young, but might stand in need of such a man's, as *Timothy's*, directions.

Or

Or *Timothy* might have ſeveral buſineſſes from the Apoſtle to this place, not much out of his way in his return to *Epheſus*. 6. After all; this alſo is not clear from doubt, whether S. *Paul* did not ſettle ſome of the *Eaſterne* Churches at a return of his thither from *Rome*, after his firſt bonds, and after the writing of this Epiſtle. For, ſome not-contemptible reaſons there are to perſwade ſuch a return.

§. 113.

[As firſt; △ his mentioning in 2 *Tim.* 4. 20. (an Epiſtle, ſome ſay, written a little before his Martyrdom and therefore in his ſecond bonds. 2 *Tim.* 4, 6.) that he left *Trophimus* at *Miletum* ſick; which could not be before, or in, his firſt journy to *Rome*; becauſe; after his departure, then, from *Miletum* (*Act.* 21. 1.) *Trophimus* is found in his company at *Jeruſalem* (*Act.* 21. 29.). Nor is there any mention made of his touching afterward at *Miletum* in his Sea-voyage to *Rome*. Likewiſe; △ his telling *Timothy*, that *Eraſtus* ſtayed at *Corinth*. But, if the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *Eraſtus* his ſtay there, when the Apoſtle went for *Jeruſalem*, and ſo for *Rome*; *Timothy*, who was with him then at *Corinth* when he left *Eraſtus* there, needed now no intelligence of this from him. △ His paſſing eight years (according to the Chronologiſts), between his firſt and ſecond bonds in *Rome*, at liberty; almoſt equalling all the time he ſpent in thoſe Eaſtern Churches from his firſt travels with *Barnabas*, till his voyage to *Rome*. In which long ſpace of time, how could thoſe Churches (ſo-much-cared for, 2 *Cor.* 11, 28.) miſs of a viſit? △ His ſending a Meſſage, (in his firſt bonds) to the *Philippians* (notwithſtanding what is ſaid *Act.* 20. 25.), *that he* **hoped to come to them ſhortly*; (Phil. 2. 24.). *Nay* **knew*, *that he ſhould abide and continue with them all* —— *that their rejoycing might be more abundant in Chriſt for him, by his coming again to them* (Phil. 1 25, 26.). △ His ſending from *Rome* to *Philemon*, a Noble Citizen of *Coloſſe*, to provide him a lodging, *for that he truſted, through their prayers, that he ſhould be given unto them* [(i. e.) the

'the *Colossians*] *Philem.* 22. △ To which may be added; 'what he saith. *Heb.* 13. 23. (an Epistle, as is conjectured 'by verse 24. sent from *Rome*) of his returning into *Judea*.

§. 114. 'Thus, is S. *Paul*'s return into the Eastern Churches, after the writing of these Epistles to the *Philippians* and 'others, asserted by many; at which return he might also make more Bishops, or also some Bishops Metropolitans. Though, (if you will indulge me to digress a 'little), several things perswade me the contrary, or at 'least, that no such Eastern progress was made before 'the writing of the second Epistle to *Timothy*: That 'which chiefly sways me is that peremptory and so much 'observed speech of his *Act.* 20. 25, 38: Which looketh more like a Prophecy; and the other, that are set 'against it, more like humane purposes and conjectures. Now, how the Apostle should visit again '*Macedonia*, and *Judea*, and not *Ephesus*, nor the *Lydian Asia*, lying between these, nor any *Asian* visit 'him, I see not. Yet if such a thing was done, it 'was not done before the Epistle sent from *Rome* to '*Timothy* (yet out of which Epistle the chief arguments are drawn for his return thither, before the 'writing of this Epistle): because S. *Paul* relateth 'therein; * what happened to him at his first appearance before *Nero*: * who then assisted, and who forsook, him, &c, (2 *Tim.* 4. 16.): which, it seemeth 'very improbable, he should declare, eight or nine 'years after the fact, to one, who is supposed to have 'lived long time with him at *Rome*, since that accident. Add to this, * his remembring to *Timothy* his 'persecutions at *Antioch*, at *Iconium*, and *Lystra*, (c. 3. '11.) *his sufferings at *Ephesus*, or also at *Rome*, from '*Alexander* the Coppersmith, giving *Timothy* also a caution concerning him; (see c. 4. 14, 15. —— compared with *Act.* 19. 33.) —— * his sending for books, and 'assistants for the Ministry (c. 4. 11, 13.); signs, that 'he saw his end not so near approaching, as some will 'gather it from c. 3. 6. * The Epistle to the *Ephesians* 'written at the same time, as this to *Timothy* (compare

2 *Tim.*

2 *Tim.* 4. 12. with *Eph.* 6. 21. and therefore *Timothy* is ‘
not named in the inſcription thereof *Eph.* 1. 1. as he is ‘
in the following Epiſtles, becauſe not as yet come to ‘
Rome,): Yet is that to the *Epheſians* generally accoun- ‘
ted to have been written not later than the reſt.—A- ‘
gain; * the Epiſtles to the *Philippians*, *Coloſſians*, and ‘
Philemon written, as before the Apoſtle's Eaſtern Pro- ‘
greſs (*Phil.* 2. 24.—*Philem.* 22.) ſo after that *Timo-* ‘
thy and *Mark* were now come to *Rome*, when *Tychicus*, ‘
one of S. *Paul*'s Miniſters, was returned now from ‘
Epheſus, and making a ſecond journy into the Eaſt ‘
(*Col.* 4. 7.), and when now *Demas* alſo was returned ‘
from his ſecular affairs; and many others, who for ‘
fear of that Tyrannous Lyon *Nero*, at the Apoſtle's firſt ‘
trial, had withdrawn themſelves (compare 2 *Tim.* 4, 16, ‘
10. —1 15.—and 2 *Tim.* 4. 11. with *Philem.* 24.—*Phi-* ‘
lip. 1. 1.). ‘

[1] As for S. *Paul*'s giving *Timothy* an account of *Tro-* ‘ §. 115.
phimus and *Eraſtus*, the Apoſtle's and *Timothie*'s for- ‘
mer aſſociates (ſee *Act.* 19. 22.—20, 4.) it is done in ‘
proſecution of what he had ſaid before concerning ‘
others of his fellow-labourers and Miniſters, 2 *Tim.* ‘
3. 10. that he was left almoſt all alone, hereby to ‘
haſten *Timothie*'s journy: minding him, * that the one ‘
of them ſtirred not from *Corinth*; For being, ſent by ‘
the Apoſtle (*Act.* 19. 22.) into *Macedonia*, and afterward ‘
with the Apoſtle at *Corinth*, when he writ his Epiſtle ‘
to the *Romans* (*Rom.* 16. 23.), yet we find not him ‘
named amongſt thoſe who return'd again with S. *Paul* ‘
from *Corinth* into *Aſia* (*Act.* 20. 4.), who alſo was ‘
Chamberlain of *Corinth* (*Rom.* 16. 23.): And, * that ‘
the other was, when he removed from *Judea* towards ‘
Rome, conveighed to *Miletum*, where his friends were, ‘
and left there behind him ſick, being unable to per- ‘
form the reſt of that journy; as if he had ſaid; *E-* ‘
raſtus, thou knoweſt, abode at *Corinth*; And I left *Tro-* ‘
phimus behind me in my journy, who return'd to ‘
Miletum, ſick: Minding *Timothy* of his lonelineſs, ‘
from ‘

'from those things, which *Timothy* well knew. Unless
'we will follow Dr. *Heylin*'s ‖ conjecture, who thinks
'the Apostle speaks here not of *Miletum* in *Asia*, but of
'another Town of the same name in *Creet* (mentioned
'by *Strabo* in his *Geograph. l.* 2.), about which Isle
'S. *Paul* hovered for a while in his voyage to *Rome*.
'[2] As for the eight or nine years freedom, which he
'is supposed to have enjoyed after his first bonds;
'△ both these words of S. *Clemens Romanus* (a compa-
'nion of the Apostle *Phil* 4. 3. and one, who well knew
'all his travels) in his Epistle to the *Corinthians* (p. 8.)
'*Paulus in Oriente ac Occidente verbi præco factus, illu-*
'*lustrem fidei suæ famam sortitus est, in justitiâ mundum uni-*
'*versum instruens, & ad* Occidentis terminos *venicns,*
'*& sub imperatoribus martyrium subiens in locum sanctum*
'*abiit, &c.* △ And the Apostle's words 2 *Tim.* 4. 17.
'*That God stood by, and strengthened, him, that the prea-*
'*ching of the Gospel might be fully known*, and that *all the*
'*Gentiles might hear it*; △ And his former designe of
'going from *Rome* into *Spain Rom.* 15. 24, 28. (which
'designe, having his liberty, I see no reason why he
'should change it); all these seem to intimate, that he
'went from *Rome* Westward; and Westward to *Spain*,
'the *terminus Occidentis*. After which, or before it,
'that he made no short excursion into some parts of the
'East, I will not press any to believe, further than
'*Act.* 20. 25. may perswade him. His intention indeed
'to do it is clear from the Texts before cited. Only
'*Heb.* 13. 23. proves little; because verse 24. ἀπὸ τῶν
'Ἰταλίας may fitlier be rendred those *from*, than those *of*,
'*Italy*; and the Epistle be written from some other
'Country. [3] As for those words 2 *Tim.* 4. 6. There was
'ground enough for such an expression, both from his
'now declining old age (*Philem.* 9.) and his then emi-
'nent danger; when he had little expectation of safety,
'and his friends deserted him for fear. Nor are they to
'be taken in so strict a sence, as not to consist with verse
'11, 13. nor to admit some further time of life, as then

‖ *Hist. Episc.* p. 1. c. 4. p. 113.

'to

to him uncertain. You may pardon this, perhaps uſeleſs, excurſion. Now, to reſume my buſineſs.]'

To *x.* Let it be granted, (though ſeveral deny it) that both the places in *Timothy* and in *Titus* ſpeak of the ſame Biſhops *i. e.* inferior Presbyters, the perſons whom *Timothy* and *Titus* for the preſent were to ordain, for the governing of thoſe Churches; *i. e.* in their own orbe, and in the Functions of a ſingle Prieſt, ſee before *Conceſſ.* 2. §. 101. As for the Apoſtle's omiſſion of the qualifications of the third Church-Officer, the Prelate, that is to be ſet over theſe Biſhops: [1] It is no way requiſite, that the Apoſtle ſhould write to *Timothy*, a Biſhop, any more, than of the choice and qualification of ſuch Officers as belonged to his preſent inſpection and Ordination. [2] Next; the Apoſtle deſcribing the requiſite manners of Church-Officers, and not the differences of their Offices; and theſe qualities in a Deacon, a Presbyter, and a Biſhop being much-what the ſame; from one only deſcribed thoſe of the other two, or from two, thoſe of the third, may eaſily be known. [3] In the Epiſtle to *Titus*, only the qualifications of a Presbyter are deſcribed *Tit.* 1. 7. may we from it collect, that the Apoſtle would have no Deacons in *Creet?* ſee the *King's* laſt Paper in the Iſle of *Wight.* p. 4. [4] But fourthly, the Biſhop-Prelates, ſuch as were to ſucceed *Timothy* and *Titus* in their Offices, are not forgotten neither, nor left without a Rule of their particular Duty; ſince the ſame directions do appertain to them, that, throughout thoſe Epiſtles, are given to thoſe their Predeceſſors, *Timothy* and *Titus*. *They* likewiſe, *to lay on hands ſuddenly on no man; To do nothing by partiality; To rebuke publickly, &c.* [5] But, ſince the other Party ſays, that theſe things alſo belong to the Presbytery, how is it, that the Apoſtle hath given no charge to the Presbytery concerning them?

§. 116. *n.* 1 R. to *x.*

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

§ 116. *n.* 2. R. to *κ*2. To *κ*2. As not the name of Pope, Archbishop, or Bishop, so neither is the name of Presbyter there; and such Negative Arguments are nothing worth. Subordinations of Church-Officers there are there; and, as to the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, the Apostles were not extraordinary and temporary Officers; but had Successors (properly) as to these Offices: and those Successors were not all *Pastors* whatever; but some advanced above the rest; to whom the times after the Apostles appropriated the name of *Bishops*; see for this the Suffrages of the Fathers quoted above from §. 53. to §. 61. But, suppose *Pastors* and *Teachers* here to express the perpetual, ordinary, Ministers: These *Pastors* are of two several degrees, whereof Bishops are the Superior, and Presbyters the Inferior; and this name *Pastor* anciently was scarce ever given to Presbyters, but only to the Bishops, whereof you may see the proof in Bishop *Andrews* his third Epistle to *P. Moulin.* And S. *Chrysostom*, upon this place, makes *Timothy* and *Titus* Pastors, when resident in those charges the Apostle committed to them.

§. 117. R. to *λ*. To *λ*. The arguing shews, that the terms of Bishop and Presbyter do not, in Scripture, always denote Prelate-Bishops, which is granted in *Concess.* 1. §. 100. Yet neither doth any thing here urged disprove *Timothy* and *Titus*, at least for some time of their sitting, to have been Metropolitans; ordaining Bishop-Prelates, as well as Bishop-Presbyters. Of which see more in Bishop *Usher*'s Original of *Metropol.* p. 67. &c. Again, neither any thing urged here, or before, proveth what is inferred in the conclusion; that Presbyters, because, sometimes in Scripture called Bishops, therefore have or had the supream Government of the Church, or the same Authority with those-now called Bishops. For, the Offices were then, as now, distinct, though not distinguished, then and now, by the same names.

To

To μ. [1] If both these Persons were Evangelists: [2] If *Evangelist* (2 *Tim.* 4. 5.) be taken in a strict, and not rather a large, sense, for a Minister of the Gospel; as some expound it from the Context, (*Gerard*); for the next words are τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον fulfil thy *Deaconship*, if I may so say; (like to that, εἰς ἔργον διακονίας *Eph.* 4. 11, 12.) [3] Again, if Evangelist, strictly taken, be an Office extraordinary belonging only to the Apostle's times, and diverse from Episcopacy; a thing not agreed-on by all their Writers (see *Zuinglius* ‖); Some thinking *Bishop* to be the *Evangelist* fixed to a Dioceſs, (Which things it concerneth me not, more narrowly to discuss); Then, I say, in these Persons, the Episcopal Office was either superadded to that of Evangelist; or introduced instead of it. For, * that the Office of ordaining, inflicting censures, &c, is that which Bishops now exercise; and * that *Timothy* and *Titus* then discharged this Office over the Presbyters, these things are granted by the Presbyterians; and, that single Persons have ever since succeded them in such Office, hath been shewed above, §. 42. *n.* 2. Mean while those, who, to relieve themselves out of a strait, bring in the distinction of making *Timothy* and *Titus* Officers extraordinary, ought seriously to consider what the *King* ‖ long since hinted to them from *Gillespy*, *Rutherford*, &c, of their own Sect, and what hath since been verified by long experience: That, as they (the Presbyterians) make the acting of these single Persons, in ordaining &c, extraordinary; so another [the *Independent* or *Quaker*] may make that which they acted, namely Ordination of Presbyters, exercising the Rules of Discipline and Government, &c, extraordinary. And so, *there will be no proof at all from Scripture of any power, left to any Ordinary Church-Officer of the following times, for the purposes aforesaid: Since, upon this very ground especially, the* Socinians, *now of a long time, deny any necessity of a successive Mission or Ordination of Ministers, or power of the Keyes. See before* §. 61. *n.* 4.

§. 118. R. to μ.

See Kings last answ. Isle of Wight. p. 15.

‖ *Tom.* 3. *p* 45. *in Eccleſiaſt. Juxta* Pauli *ſententiam, idem Epiſcopi, & Evangeliſtæ officium.*

‖ *Laſt. anſw.* p. 15.

§. 119. R. to v. 1.

To *v.* See what is said before to *y*——The Church-Government of *Ephesus*, in the Apostle's last farewel at *Miletum*, is not committed wholly or supreamly into the hand of Presbyters. First, because, long after this Conference at *Miletum*, it is manifest, from the second Epistle written to *Timothy* from *Rome*, both, * that *Timothy* then resided in the same place; *viz.* either at *Ephesus*, or in some part of the *Lydian Asia* not far from it (which *Asia* the Apostle includeth within the Church of *Ephesus*, and under *Timothy*'s Government. See *Act.* 19. 10.——20. 18.): And * that the Apostle continued him still in the same Office, in his second Epistle, wherein he constituted him, in his first. For, * here, in this second Epistle, the Apostle giveth him the same charge still, as in the former,; *to keep what was committed to his trust*; ——*and to excite and stir up the gift conferred upon him by imposition of hands*; (see 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. compared with 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. ——and 2 *Tim.* 1. 14. compared with 1 *Tim.* 6. 20.) * Here he giveth him the like Rules and Instructions concerning his duty and behaviour in his Office: (see 2 *Tim.* 2. 23, 24, 25, 26.——3. 5, 16, 17.——4. 1, 2, 5. compared with 1 *Tim.* 6. 13. ——4. 13. and many other places.) * Here he speaketh of the like Persons, Errors and Faults, to be opposed, to be corrected, as in the former Epistle: foretelling to *Timothy* in both these Epistles, as he did to the Presbyters of the same Church (*Act.* 20. 29, 30, 31.), what wicked and perverse, both Teachers, and Hearers, should afterwards perplex the Church (see 2 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2.——compared with 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2.——2 *Tim.* 2. 14, 16, 17, 18. compared with 1 *Tim.* 6. 4. 20, 21.——2 *Tim.* 2. 23.——4. 4. compared with 1 *Tim.* 1. 4.——4. 7.): giving him charge to ordain, and commit over his Doctrine to, faithful Pastors, such as are ἱκανοὶ διδάξαι (2 *Tim.* 2. 2) or διδακτικοὶ (1 *Tim.* 3. 2.). * Here, (which may shew clearly *Timothy*'s Jurisdiction still having relation to the same place and Church), he mentioneth and complaineth to *Timothy* of the same refractory Persons

Perſons of *Epheſus* (as in his former Epiſtle); of *Hymeneus*, and of *Alexander*, whom he had excommunicated, giving *Timothy* warning to be aware of them, and inſtructing him, how to carry himſelf toward them. (ſee 2 *Tim.* 2. 17. ——and 4. 14, 15. compared with 1 *Tim.* 1. 20.——*Act.* 19. 33.). He telleth *Timothy*, that *all* they, that are in, or of, *Aſia*, I ſuppoſe, thoſe, who having their uſual dwelling in *Aſia* then ſojourned at *Rome*, had forſaken him, *i. e.* by returning into *Aſia*, ſee *chap.* 4. 10, 11, 16. and adds: *This thou knoweſt*: as he dwelling upon the place, 2 *Tim.* 1. 15. *All*, except only *Oneſiphorus*, an *Epheſian*; who there ſought out the Apoſtle, relieved him, and was not aſhamed of his Chain, and beſides, had done much ſervice at *Epheſus* (but the ſpecifying of this ſervice [*to me*] is not in the Greek), *ſicut tu melius noſti*, ſaith he, (2 *Tim.* 1. 17,18.). ——* Here he ſendeth recommendations to ſeveral living at *Epheſus*, to *Priſca* and *Aquila*, (ſee 2 *Tim.* 4. 19. compared with *Act.* 18. 26.), and to the Houſhold of *Oneſiphorus*, himſelf being then deceaſed: and giveth him an account of *Tychicus*, and *Trophymus*, and *Eraſtus*, *Aſians*, (*Act.* 20. 4.——19. 22.): likewiſe he requireth *Timothy* to bring with him from *Troas* his Books, &c, becauſe, out of *Aſia*, that was his way. All theſe things moſt clearly manifeſt *Timothy* to retain ſtill the ſame Commiſſion, and Authority over the ſame Perſons, when this ſecond Epiſtle was written; as he did, when the firſt, and, here, to have kept his reſidence.

As for that Phraſe, *Tychicus* have I ſent to *Epheſus*, it may well conſiſt with *Timothy*'s abode there: as in a Letter we ſay, I ſhall at ſuch a time come to *London*; or I have ſent ſuch a Servant to *London*, when he, to whom we write, is there: though it ſerveth our turn, if *Timothy* reſided any where in the Proconſular *Aſia*, *i. e.* within his own Dioceſs, or Province. §. 120.

2ly. That the Apoſtle appointed *Timothy*'s Preſidency over Presbyters as a continual and ſtanding Government in the Church, may be collected from this ſufficiently; §. 121. *n.* 1, 2.

that

that it was conferred on him not before, but after, the ſettling of the Presbytery of *Epheſus*. For, in this numerous Church, which was of the largeſt extent of any, that the Apoſtle founded, (for all the Proconſular *Aſia* flowed in unto it, *Act.* 19. 10.) after that the Apoſtle had cultivated, and husbanded it with ſuch incredible diligence three years together (*Act.* 20. 31.) which was a much longer time, than he had ſpent on any other Church; and, therefore after that he had done here, what elſewhere (*Act.* 14. 23. —1 *Tim.* 4. 14. —— 5. 17, 19.), *viz.* conſtituted a Presbytery; after all this, at his going away, he committed to *Timothy*, a ſingle Perſon, over theſe Presbyters, ſuch a Power and Superintendency, as we ſee deſcribed in his firſt Epiſtle. But why, can we think, did not the Apoſtle, eſpecially in this great Church, brought by his own hand to more perfection than any other, and whoſe Conſtitution might be a pattern to the reſt, Why did he not now begin that courſe for Ordination, Church-Cenſures, &c, in it, wherein he would have it to continue? Why ſuſpend the Presbyters Right, as to equality of Power, for *Timothy*'s days? Or, if he did now ſet it up, I mean a Court of Presbytery Supream and Independent on any ſuperior ſingle Perſon, how will not this hinder *Timothy*'s acting, as well as it doth the Biſhop's, his Succeſſors? (See before §. 73. n. 2.)? And why no directions given to this Presbytery, concerning their Ordinations, Acts of Judicature, &c, as to *Timothy* there be? Again, ſince they ſay, Presbyteries are not ſet up without a *primus Presbyter*, Preſident, or Moderator, of the reſt (ſee *Blond.* before §. 79. *n.* 1.); I ask, whether was *Timothy* the *primus Presbyter*, at that time in *Epheſus*, or ſome other? Their chiefeſt, if not their only, ground in Antiquity, for this conceit of a *primus Presbyter*, is that Authority of one *Hilary* quoted before *Sect.* 76. *n.* 1. Now he ſaith plainly, that *Timothy* was ſo. If *Timothy* was then the *primus Presbyter*, his Authority is the ſame with a Prelate-Biſhop's (ſee before *Sect.* 73. *n.* 1.); and why

why ſhould not then *Timothy*'s Succeſſors in this *Primus-ſhip* have the ſame Authority as he? But, if another and not *Timothy*, was then the *primus Presbyter* there, beſides their deſerting their Patron, *Hilary*, they muſt either make two heads of the Clergy in *Epheſus*, as hath been ſaid: or they muſt confeſs the Apoſtle, after conſtituting a Presbytery, and a Primate, yet to have thought fit, and that in a Church ſo long husbanded and perfectly formed, to leave a Superior to this Primate, for Ordinations and other Church-matters: and him ſettled in that Church; as we have ſhewed but now.

3ly. To the Precedents this may be added; That the Presbyterians, when provoked by later Sects (proceeded to deny their Miniſtry, as they do Epiſcopacy, of which ſee more below §. 195.) to prove the *Perpetuation* of ſuch Miniſtry, do it chiefly from theſe very Inſtances of *Timothy* and *Titus*, and from the Rules and Proofs extracted out of thoſe three Epiſtles written to them. §. 121. *n.* 2. 3.

[Of theſe Epiſtles they confeſs, ‘(*Jus divin. Miniſt. Evang.* p. 186.) *that all that is* ‘*written in the Epiſtles concerning the Ordainers and the* ‘*qualifications of the Ordained*, &c, *is all written in the* ‘*Epiſtles to* Timothy *and* Titus——*ibid.* (p. 162.). To ‘prove the conſtant Succeſſion of the Miniſtry, they ‘argue on this manner: *That Chriſt was ſent, and had* ‘*his Commiſſion, from his Father. That Chriſt as he* ‘*was ſent of his Father, ſo he ſent forth his Apoſtles. That* ‘*the Apoſtles went about Ordaining Elders in every Church:* ‘*and that the Apoſtle* Paul *Ordained* Timothy *and* Titus. ‘*That* Timothy *and* Titus [again] *did Ordain others,* ‘as they themſelves had been Ordained; *and that by* ‘the Apoſtle's own appointment. ——*And as* Timothy ‘*was intruſted with the word of Chriſt, ſo he was com-* ‘*manded to commit the ſame truſt to faithful Men, able to* ‘*teach others alſo, that ſo there might be a Succeſſion of* ‘*Teachers.* ——Again (p. 74.) they ſay: *That the di-* ‘*rections to* Timothy *were not given for that Age only,* ‘*but* ‘

'*but for all the Ages of the Church to the end of the World,* '*as appears evidently* (say they) *from* 1 Tim. 6. 18. com- 'pared with 1 *Tim.* 5. 7. 21. *He being charged, in the* '*first Text, to keep those Commandments without spot, till* '*the appearance of Jesus Christ*, [therefore he, and his 'Successors, to keep them]; *in the second, a solemn charge* '*being particularly applied to quicken his diligence and faith-* '*fulness about Church-matters, and especially about the Or-* '*dination, Honor, and maintenance of the Ministry*, &c. '—Again, p. 160. they say; *that the Apostolical Ex-* '*amples* [one of which is his setting *Timothy* a single Per- 'son over the Church of *Ephesus*, and *Titus* over *Creet*] '*in the things necessary for the good of the Church and which* '*have a perpetual reason and equity in them*, [as I con- 'ceive the avoiding of Schisms is such], *have the* '*force of a rule,——else we should be left at uncertainties.*] —Thus the Presbyterians labour to prove Perpetuity (and that in the Instances of *Timothy* and *Titus*) against an Adversary, that would make the Scripture-Ministery a Ministry extraordinary, and only fitted for the first Plantation of the Gospel. Now, whereas the Apostles Ordained two sorts of sacred Ministers: First, Common Elders, or Presbyters: and 2ly. Single Persons, as *Timothy* and *Titus*, Superior Governors over those Presbyters: and then; ordered *Timothy* and *Titus* to do to others, as the Apostle had done to them, (which is often urged by the Presbyterians to prove the perpetuity of the Evangelical Ministery); I can see no reason, why the Presbyterians should affirm, that *Timothy* and *Titus* their doing like the Apostles, in Ordaining Presbyters, was to be perpetual; but their doing like the Apostles, in Ordaining other single Persons to govern those Presbyters for future Ages so, as themselves were Ordained to govern them then, that this was not to be perpetual. If any perpetual, why not both? if not both, why either? Nor see I any reason, why the Apostle making *Timothy* and *Titus* Superior, and other Presbyters Inferior (no doubt for

for good reaſons); the one muſt be called an extraordinary, the other an ordinary, Officer; and not both ordinary; and the one called a Superior, and the other an Inferior Officer. And, if *Timothy* was Ordained to an extraordinary, not ordinary, Office, as they affirm; why urge they *Timothy*'s Ordination, as a pattern, to juſtifie, againſt their Adverſaries, the continued Ordination of others to this day, as they frequently do? (See *Jus divin.* p. 159. 167. and elſewhere). and why are the Precepts, given by the Apoſtle to this extraordinary Governor, extended by them to all Church-Governors following; to whom they will not allow the ſame Priviledges, as *Timothy* had?

To ξ. See what is ſaid before to θ. §. 122.

To π. See what is ſaid before to κ. In the third Chapter is the deſcription of the manners of Presbyters and Deacons: in the whole Epiſtle, the Deſcription of *Timothy*'s, and of Biſhops. R. to ξ. §. 123. R. to π.

To ρ. Non-conſtant reſidence of *Timothy* at *Epheſus* or in *Aſia*, and of *Titus* in *Creet*, is proved, and granted. They were rare Perſons (ſee *Phil.* 2. 20, 22. 2 *Cor.* 8. 23.) eſpecially *Timothy*; and the Apoſtle's ancient Aſſiſtants (*Act.* 16. 1. *Gal.* 2. 1.) eſpecially *Titus*; a Greek brought with him to *Antioch*, at his return thither from his firſt Weſtern Progreſs. And the Apoſtle who took upon him the care of ſo many Churches (2 *Cor.* 11. 28.), had great need of them. Yet, for *Timothy*'s Reſidence; S. *Paul* going up to *Jeruſalem*, it ſeems, left him behind him in *Aſia* at his charge. For, after his accompanying the Apoſtle into *Aſia* (*Act.* 20. 4.), we find, though frequent before, no, mention of him afterward, in S. *Paul*'s Story. Only; after S. *Paul* had been two years Priſoner in *Cæſarea* (*Act.* 24. 27.) and, then, a year or two Priſoner in *Rome* (or, as ſome ſay, nine or ten years after, in S. *Paul*'s ſecond Impriſonment at *Rome*) an Epiſtle is ſent to *Timothy*, and that alſo (as hath been ſaid) findeth him upon his charge: and giveth him many directions concerning the right diſ- §. 124. R. to ρ.

charge thereof. *Timothy* being called in this Epistle, for a season, to *Rome*, to accompany the Apostle almost left alone, the Apostle promiseth to send him thence to the *Philippians*; but this was in the way to his own Province of *Asia*. The Apostle promiseth likewise (*Heb.* 13. 23.) *Timothy*'s Journy into *Judea*: But it is uncertain, when, or whence, that Epistle was written.

§. 125. This, for *Timothy*. As for *Titus*: the time of his being left in *Creet* is somewhat uncertain. The Apostle's Epistle to him some think to be written from *Ephesus*, S. *Paul* mentioning therein *Tychicus* and *Apollos*, whose ordinary abode was at *Ephesus*, (1 *Cor.* 16. 12.—*Act.* 18. 24.): and perhaps the Epistle was sent by *Apollos* and *Zenas*; whom the Apostle desireth him to bring on their Journey, and supply what was wanting to them. If so, *Titus* resided in *Creet* those three years that S. *Paul* did in *Ephesus*, before he was sent for to *Nicopolis*, or, as some think, *Neapolis* (see *Act.* 16. 11.); But, supposing the Epistle to *Titus* written much later in some time of the three months the Apostle spent in *Greece*, *Act.* 20. 3. and not long after *Titus* his settlement in *Creet*, yet, when the Apostle sent for him to *Nicopolis*, *Tychicus* was sent to *Creet*; as, when he sent for *Timothy* to *Rome*, *Tychicus* was sent to *Ephesus*: some think, to supply their place in their absence: And after *Titus* his small stay with the Apostle, and negotiating the Apostle's Affairs, till he came to *Corinth*, 'tis probable, that he returned to *Creet*, for we find no mention of his return with the Apostle into *Macedonia* or *Asia*, there, where all the Persons of note, that accompanied S. *Paul*, seem particularly to be named. (*Act.* 20. 4.) Nor any mention of his stay at *Corinth*; there where *Timothy* and the rest of S. *Paul*'s eminent Fellow-labourers are, occasionally, named. *Rom.* 16. 21, 22, 23. Only at *Rome* he visited the Apostle again, and from thence fetched a compass, in his return to *Creet*, into *Dalmatia*; likely upon the Apostle's Mission, whilst

Tit. 1. 3. 12.
2 *Tim.* 4. 12.

whilſt himſelf was Priſoner in *Rome*, and reſtrained from travelling, to viſit ſome Churches there planted by him. From hence I think it will appear, that we have little reaſon to caſt off the univerſal Tradition of the Church, which makes theſe two Perſons to have a particular relation to theſe Churches, and reckoneth, in theſe Churches only, and not in others, a Succeſſion from them. *Rom.* 15. 19.

§. 126. R. to σ.

To σ. That the Apoſtle conſtituted *Timothy* a perpetual Officer, for the employments, which are in that Epiſtle committed to him, ſee 1 *Tim.* 6. 14. ——and 2 *Tim.* 4. 5. compared with 6. though indeed the Apoſtle requireth *Timothy*'s greater vigilance therein, in the time of his own abſence, when as he had a purpoſe to return (1 *Tim.* 4. 13.——3. 14, 15.). Beſides the whole Tenure * of the firſt Epiſtle giving ſo many Rules and Cautions about a right diſcharge of his duty, and again, * of the ſecond Epiſtle many years after, like to the firſt, do ſhew, that *Timothy*'s was no occaſional, but a fixt, employment. The ſame may be ſaid of *Titus*. And that this perpetual and fixed employment was alſo ſpecially appropriated to thoſe places, ſee what is ſaid before to ν. and ρ.

§. 127. R. to τ. 1.

To τ. 1. πρεσβυτερίου is taken for the Office, and applied, not to χειρῶν in the Text, but to χαρίσματος, by ſome of the ancient, [amongſt others by S. *Jerom* on this Text, calling it *Ordinatio Epiſcopatus*; and by the other Author, made ſo much uſe of, *Hilarius*. See his words on this place compared with thoſe on 1 *Tim.* 3. 8. ——and 2 *Tim.* 1. 6.]: and of late by *Calvin* upon the Text, thus far, as to ſay, — *Omnibus expenſis, hunc ſenſum non male quadrare, ut* [Presbyterium] *ſit nomen officii*: But, in his *Inſtitutions* ‖ ſo far, as to ſpeak on this manner. —*Paulus ſe, non alios complures* Timotheo *manus impoſuiſſe commemorat* 2 Tim. 1. 6. *Nam quod, in alterâ Epiſtolâ, de impoſitione manuum Presbyterii dicitur, non ita accipio, quaſi* Paulus *de ſeniorum Collegio loquatur: Sed hoc nomine Ordinationem ipſam intelligo: quaſi diceret. Fac ut gratia quam, cùm* ‖ *Lib.* 4. *c.* 3. *Sect.* 16.

cùm te Presbyterum crearem, per manuum impositionem recepisti, non sit irrita. As if it run thus, — *Neglect not the gift of the Presbytership, which was given thee by imposition of hands.* (Not as the Assembly ‖ understands these Commentators, to say —*With the laying on of the hands of the Office*, and so in vain dispute against their own mistake). And this Interpretation is favoured, in that we find the Commission for Ordination, that was given to *Timothy* and to *Titus*, to run single (*Tit.* 1. 5. —1 *Tim.* 5. 22.): —— And S. *Paul* to mention only the laying of his own hands on *Timothy*, (2 *Tim.* 1. 6.) as *Calvin* observes: and lastly, in that we find, anciently πρεσβυτέριον used as well for the Office of Presbytership, as for a Consistory of Presbyters: See *Conc. Nic.* c. 2.——*Concil. Ancyran.* c. 18.—— *Euseb.* l. 6. c. 7.

‖ *J. Div.* 1. part. p. 181.

2. [2] Again; *Presbyterium*, as taken for the Ordainers, and applied to χειρῶν, is understood of the Apostles, or of Apostlical Persons, [*qui Apostolicam gratiam acceperunt*] and Bishop-Prelates, by others of the Ancients: such, as laid on hands at *Antioch.* *Act.* 13. 3. And as are mentioned in the higher ranks of Church-Governours, in 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. —— *Eph.* 4. 11. For, as it is granted, that Bishops, that Apostolical Persons, and, sometimes, that Apostles, were then called *Presbyters* (1 *Pet.* 5. 1. —— 2 *John* 1.), so might they be collectively called Presbytery, after the former pattern of the Jews highest spiritual Officers, and Court, called so *Luke* 22. 66. —— *Act.* 22. 5. Nay, are called so even the Apostles themselves, by S. *Ignatius*, after *Timothy*'s time; πρεσβυτέριον ἐκκλησίας. *Ep. ad Philadelph.* πρεσφυγὼν τὸ εὐαγγελίῳ, ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας.

Chrysostom. Theodoret. Theophylact. in locum.

3. But 3ly. Let *Presbyterium* here be meant of the Inferior, and ordinary Presbytery: Yet there were the Apostle *Paul*'s hands in the Ordination; as well as theirs: and those hands are sufficient, with, or without, theirs. (see 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands*; compared with * *Act.* 19. 6. where he confers the

the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt with laying on his hands ſingly, though ſeveral eminent Perſons *Timothy*, *Eraſtus* and others, then accompanied him. *Act.* 19. 22.—— And * *Act.* 14. 23. Where he makes Presbyters, without aſſiſtance of Presbyters). Neither doth it follow: S. *Paul*, then, laid on hands together with the Presbyters, therefore he would, never do it himſelf, never have others to do it, without them. Indeed S. *Paul* might uſe, becauſe there was none made Biſhops before *Timothy*, or none at hand, the Solemnity of the Presbyter's aſſiſtance, yet without any neceſſity thereof; as now Biſhops do, in Ordination of Presbyters, without conceiting an abſolute neceſſity thereof. *Pelagius* (Biſhop of *Rome A. D.* 555.) his Ordination, performed by two Biſhops and one Presbyter, was by the Catholicks not accounted defective. But the Presbytery's laying on hands in Ordination, without an Apoſtle or a Biſhop, this cannot be ſhewed; this, this Text proveth not.

To 72. The conſequence, which they draw from their obſervation, is manifeſtly diſproved by theſe Texts (to which many more might be added)——*Act.* 19. 6. ——*Mat.* 19. 15.—— *Mar.* 6. 5. ——*Num.* 27. 23.—— *Deut.* 34. 9. in the *Septuagint*: In all which, ἐπιθεσις χειρῶν, in the plural, is applied to one only Impoſer of hands; and ſo it is in that Text alſo, 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. Where, if impoſition of more hands, than *Timothy*'s only, had been implied, it would not have followed immediately [*Neither be Thou*, but, *Neither be ye, partakers of other men's ſins.*] R. to 72.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

§. 128. *R.* to their Objections out of the Fathers.

R. to *v.*

TO *v.* I answer to S. *Clemens*'s stile, what to the Apostle's, *Phil.* 1. 1. (see answer to *θ.*) [1] *Clemens* himself is reckoned by Antiquity in the Roll of the *Roman* Bishops (see before §. 42. *n.* 5.); and these Bishops are shewed, by the Testimony of Antiquity, to have had not only a superior place, but Authority, to the rest of the Presbyters there (§. 48. *n.* 1.): The same Ecclesiastical Government, to be presumed at *Corinth*, as at *Rome*. [2] And *Hegesippus*, (a Writer before *A. D.* 140.) making mention of *Clement*'s Epistle nameth also *Primus* for Bishop, at that time, of the *Corinthians*: *Primus*, such a Bishop, there; as *Anicetus*, and *Eleutherius* at *Rome*, *i. e.* a Prelate. [3] A Bishop, or Presbyter-President to have been then at *Corinth*, the Presbyterians allow; *Clemens* his not mentioning such his Brother President argueth not, that there was none such; therefore neither doth *Clemens* a Prelate his not mentioning such his Brother Prelate; Besides that this Epistle was written, not in the name of *Clemens*, but of the whole Church. [4] *Clemens*, in that Epistle, had not occasion to mention or vindicate the Bishop's Authority so much, as that in general of all the Presbyters, against whom, in general, the *Corinthians* contended, and had ejected several of them wrongfully. [5] Yet lastly, this Father, in that Epistle, mentions a triple Order of Ecclesiastical Officers: For p. 53. He inveighing against the Laicks disturbance of the Ecclesiastical Functions, and publick Order of Divine Service in that Church, in allusion to the regular Service under the Old Testament, hath these words. — *Summo Sacerdoti sua munera tributa sunt: Sacerdotibus locus proprius assignatus est; & Levitis sua ministeria incumbunt: Laicus præceptis Laicis constringitur: Unusquisque Vestrum (Fratres) in suo ordine, & statione,*

tione, manens cum bonâ conſcientiâ εὐχαριστεῖτω Θεῷ, *Gratias agat*, or rather, comparing the Context, *Euchariſtiam celebret Deo cum decore, non tranſcendens præſcriptum miniſterii* [or *Liturgiæ*] *ejus Canonem.* By *Summus Sacerdos*, here is meant the Biſhop.

To φ. [1] I anſwer to S. *Polycarp*, as to S. *Clemens.* [2] In the Title of that Epiſtle *Polycarp* himſelf is clearly diſtinguiſhed from the other Presbyters of *Smyrna.* —— *Polycarpus, quique cum eo Presbyteri, Eccleſiæ Dei* Philippis *diverſanti*; and, concerning his being ſupream Governor of that Church, ſee before §. 42. n. 2. and what is ſaid of him, * by the Church of *Smyrna*, ‖ in relating his Martyrdom, whereof they were eye-witneſſes, where they ſtile him, *Catholicæ Smyrnenſis Eccleſiæ Epiſcopus*: which *Euſebius* underſtood thus; *Qui illi Eccleſiæ præfuit.* (See l. 4. c. 15.——l. 3. c. 33.). * By *Polycrates*, Biſhop of *Epheſus* not long after his days in *Euſebius* l. 5. c. 22. and * by *Irenæus*, in *Euſebius* l. 5. c. 23. and before in §. 48. *n.* 1. and laſtly * by S. *Ignatius Polycarp*'s Contemporary, in his Epiſtle to the *Smyrneans*, exhorting their Obedience to him, as unto God; and to his Presbytery, as to the Apoſtles. See before §. 44. *n.* 1. Now the ſame Eccleſiaſtical Government is to be preſumed at *Philippi*, as at *Smyrna.* Nay; ſee the *Philippians* particularly named by *Tertullian* (*de Præſcript.* c. 36. cited before §. 50.) to have had a Succeſſion of Biſhops from the Apoſtles. Their Biſhop in S. *Ignatius* his Epiſtle to them, (but, whether this genuine, is uncertain), is called *Vitalis.* In S. *Polycarp* his Epiſtle, one *Valens* is called Presbyter of that Church κατ' ἄλλον, perhaps their Biſhop at that time; though one, who, through covetouſneſs and incontinency, had, ſome way or other, it ſeems, much miſ-behaved himſelf. [3] Obſerve alſo in that Epiſtle of his, that though he involves the Biſhop in the name of Presbyter, and therefore ſaith *Presbyteris, ut Deo* the Supream. (See before §. 101. *n.* 1.) yet he no where calleth the Presbyters by the name of *Biſhops* as this Objection

§. 129. R. to φ.

‖ Ap. *Euſeb.* l. 4. c. 15.

Objection pretends he doth; that began, so early, to be laid aside.

§. 130. R. to χ¹. To χ¹. See the first *Concession*, §. 100. And how *Irenæus* clearly placeth a superior Authority in those Bishops, whom (according to the use of those times) he not unfrequently calleth Presbyters, §. 48. *n.* 2.

R. to χ². To χ². It is conceded, that the Apostles, at their first Foundation, ordained only Presbyters and Deacons in some, or most, or all, Churches, if you will; they themselves supplying for a time the place of the Bishop (See *Act.* 13. 23.), till they found other Persons worthy of the Office, and till their own remoter Affairs hindred, for any longer time, their own superintendency. Of these first beginnings only *Epiphanius* declares himself to speak. *Non enim omnia* (saith he in the same place) *potuerunt Apostoli constituere.* ——And ——*Singulæ res non ab initio omnia habuerunt; sed progressu temporis ea, quæ ad necessariorum perfectionem requiruntur, parabantur:* and what is this to proving, that the Government of the Church by Bishops, or by Presbyters, was to the Apostles indifferent? or, that any Church, when the Apostle's work was compleated, was left without a Bishop? Or, that their Structures, finished, were not all uniform?

§. 131. R. to ϟ. 1. To ϟ. First, that you may take a full view of this Father's Opinion; I desire you to read o're again the Testimonies recited out of him before §. 42. *n.* 2.—— §. 60.——§. 76. *n.* 2. Which Testimonies are as full, as any, for three distinct degrees of Clergy; and for a superior Authority to that of Presbyters, both practised in the Apostle's days, and instituted by them. which places receive no answer from the contrary Party, unless these. △ That S. *Hierome*, sometimes writes other Men's Opinions, sometimes his own, without a distinctive note: and therefore may sometimes seem to contradict himself: urging for this a mistaken passage of his in one of his Epistles to S. *Austin.* —‖ *Itaque, ut simpliciter fatear, legi hæc omnia,* &c. *mistaken,* I say; as appears

Mr. *Stillingf. Irən.* p. 278.

‖ *Aug.* Ep. 11.

appears by thoſe words following. —*Ex hoc oſtendi me non ex definito*, &c. Again: ▵ that, in thoſe we have cited, he ſpeaketh vulgarly and not to the point in debate; as in theſe places he doth; which they quote out of him ‖. But how is this? when as one chief place of thoſe [*ut ſciamus traditiones Apoſtolicas*, &c. See before §. 60.] is taken out of the very ſame Epiſtle *ad Evagrium*, out of which the other words are (here) quoted by them? Is one part of the ſame Epiſtle, that ſerveth for them, ſpoken to the point; the other part, that maketh againſt them, not ſo? This place *Blondel*, though he entitleth his Book againſt Epiſcopacy, *Apologia pro ſententiâ Hieronymi*, leaveth unſpoken to; ſaying, that he will anſwer to it in his ſixth *Section*; but in his Book he hath but three.—And ſo, before him, hath *Salmaſius*, in his Book againſt Epiſcopacy, left it untouched; ſaying, that he will anſwer to it in his Book *de Ordine Eccleſiaſtico*; but, when he writ this Book, he forgot his promiſe.

‖ See ſecond Paper Iſle of *Wight*, p. 19.

§. 132.

This Debt, never ſatisfied, of theſe two Famous men Dr. *Hammond* obſerved, and ſpake of, and his obſervation provoketh the Aſſembly-Divines in *Jus Divin. Miniſt. Angl.* ‖ to give their anſwer to it, which they extract out of *Smectymnuus*; *This Epiſcopacy is an Apoſtolical Tradition in S.* Jerom's *ſenſe, ſeeing with him Apoſtolical Tradition, and Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom are the ſame. Witneſs that inſtance of the obſervation of Lent, which he, writing* ad Marcellum, *ſaith, it is* Apoſtolica traditio: *yet writing* adverſus Luciferianos *ſaith, it is* Eccleſiæ conſuetudo. *Whereby it fully appears, that* Jerom *by Apoſtolical Tradition meant not an Apoſtolical Inſtitution, but an Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom.* Thus they. Where read the word *Inſtitution*, Tradition, (for theſe two are the ſame), and their anſwer is, that *Jerom*, by Apoſtolical Tradition, meant, not an Apoſtolical Tradition. Indeed the Father may call an Apoſtolical Tradition alſo an Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom, as he did *Lent*. Why not? the ſecond followeth from the firſt. But yet he cannot there-

‖ *Append. prop.* 3. p. 103.

fore truly call a Church-custom, begun and delivered, only after the Apostle's times, a Tradition Apostolical: for the terms contradict; and if Episcopacy be only a thing *consuetum, & traditum, post Apostolos*, it hence necessarily followeth, that it is not a Tadition Apostolical. Are we then gotten any further, by this, than where *Salmasius* and *Blondel* left us? But, if this instance of *Smectymnuus* fail, there is yet another place of S. *Jerom* produced for them, an unanswerable Testimony (as it is called ‖) that, with this Father *Apostolica traditio* is nothing else, but *consuetudo Ecclesiæ*. The passage is in his *Ep. ad Lucinum*. Where, being asked a Question about fasting on Saturdays, the Father, in an uncertainty of Apostolick Tradition in this matter, and several Provinces receiving from their Ancestors several Customs, concludes thus. *Unaquæque Provincia abundet in suo sensu, & præcepta majorum leges Apostolicas arbitretur.* R. *Arbitretur*, that is, take them for, reverence, obey, or conform to, them, as if they were Apostolick Orders; *viz.* where they are not certain, they are otherwise. But what is this to our matter in hand? * where the Father is said by them to have decided the point of Episcopacy, and declared it by his *postea*, and *paulatim*, not to be Apostolical Tradition, but latter Ecclesiastical Custom: And * where it is shewed by us, that the other expressions of this Father do here confine *Apostolica traditio* to its strict sense (however it may be taken elsewhere for, *virorum Apostolicorum*, i. e. *Ecclesiastica traditio*, or what you fancy). For as he calls Bishops *traditio Apostolica*; so he nameth the several Bishops ordained, not by the Church, or *viri Apostolici* following the Apostles, but by the very Apostles, in several Churches, as their Successors (see before §. 42. *n.* 2. *Jacobus, &c.*). So he saith, that the Bishops following *tenent locum, stant loco, Apostolorum*; calls their Authority, *virga Apostolica* —— makes them the Apostle's Children, in *Psal.* 45. makes them, and Presbyters, and Deacons under the New Testament to

‖ Mr. *Stillingf. Iren.* p. 278.

answer

anſwer *Aaron*, and his Children, and the Levites under the Old. Now would he, or after him *Iſidore*, or *Concil. Hiſpalenſ.* 2. make ſuch a compariſon, did they think only Presbyters, under the New Teſtament, to be Chriſt's, and the Apoſtle's, genuine Progeny; and theſe Presbyters afterward to beget, and ſet up, Biſhops over them? No. They taking the Biſhops for the Fathers, Presbyters for the Children, are far from ſuch a conceit. For (as *Epiphanius* againſt *Aerius* Hær. 75.) *Presbyterorum* [*i. e.* filiorum] *Ordo non eſt potens generare patres.* But yet we are not at reſt. For further it is ſaid; that this *traditio Apoſtolica* of *Jerom*, being allowed for *traditio Apoſtolorum*, yet doth not put *any difference between Biſhops and Presbyters in that place* (*for it is not imaginable that a man, who had been proving all along the ſuperiority of a Presbyter above a Deacon, becauſe of his identity with a Biſhop in the Apoſtle's times, ſhould, at the ſame time, ſay, that a Biſhop was above a Presbyter by the Apoſtle's Inſtitution; and ſo directly overthrow all ſaid before*) *but only declares.*——*That as* Aaron *and his Sons in the Order of Prieſthood were above the Levites under the Law, ſo the Biſhops and the Presbyters, in the Order of the Evangelical Prieſthood, are above the Deacons under the Goſpel.* Aaron *and his Sons being uſed as one part of the compariſon, Levites as the other.* But firſt I ſay; that *Iſidore Hiſpalenſis* who is ſaid ‖ to have followed the ſteps of this Father in this opinion, leaves out Levites and Deacons, and proſecutes the compariſon, and the diſtinction only in the other Members thereof: which ſee below §. 135. *n.* 2. Nay S. *Jerom* himſelf elſewhere doth ſo too, in *Ep. ad Nepotianum*; where directing him how to behave himſelf in the Clergy he writes thus.—*Eſto ſubjectus Pontifici tuo, &, quaſi animæ parentem, ſuſpice.*——*Si pater ſum, ubi honor meus, &c?* —— *Illud etiam dico; quod Epiſcopi ſacerdotes ſe eſſe noverint, non Dominos. Honorent clericos quaſi clericos; ut & ipſis à clericis, quaſi Epiſcopis, honor deferatur. Scitum eſt illud Oratoris* Domitii. *Cur ego te, inquit, habeam ut Principem,*

1. ‖ V. Mr. *Stillingf. Iren.* p. 313.

Principem, cùm tu me non habeas ut Senatorem? Quod *Aaron*, & filios ejus; hoc Episcopum & Presbyteros *esse*
2. *noverimus*. But 2ly. I say, in this very Epistle, doth not S. *Jerom* make a difference between Bishops and Presbyters, *viz.* in the power of Ordination (so that he affirms them only in many things the same, [and this, I hope, is enough to give Presbyters superiority to Deacons,] not in all)? *Quid enim*, saith he, *exceptâ Ordinatione facit Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?* Will they say here, that he speaks only of modern Bishops, not of those of the Apostle's times? But whom can they hope to perswade, that *James*, *Timothy*, *Titus*, Bishops, whom this Father affirms to be made by the Apostles, did not differ, in his opinion, from a *Jerusalem*, *Ephesian*, or *Cretian*, Presbyter in the Authority of Ordination? and why infers he then, upon those words *Tit.* 1. 5., *audiant Episcopi, qui habent constituendi Presbyteros per singulas urbes potestatem?* Whence then derived Bishops this their Power, but from the same Fountain with *Titus*? Let, therefore, the Father, in those places, which they produce for their opinion, be interpreted in what sense, and the *postea*, and *paulatim*, be applied to what times, they please, (though contrary to the Evidences produced above, and especially to that out of S. *Ignatius* §. 42. *n.* 4. naming several Bishops of his time, who yet was contemporary with S. *John*) It appears by other sayings of his produced by us, that He is but thus at last brought by them to contradict himself (which contradiction others, by applying *postea*, and *paulatim*, to the Apostle's times, or by the Comment here following (fig. 3. §. 134.) do easily cure): and so S. *Jerom*, by this, being dis-enabled to be a Witness, ought by both Parties to be laid aside, and the Cause tried by the rest of the Ancients, whose Testimonies are more clear.

§. 133. 2. 2ly. To come to what he saith in these places produced by them. In these S. *Hierom* rightly proveth thus much, *Episcopus* and *Presbyter*, in some places of Scripture,

to

to ſignifie the ſame thing or Perſon, (agreeable to the firſt *Conceſſion* above §. 100.): and the name of Presbyter to agree alſo to the higheſt Apoſtle. For ſo alſo doth the name of Deacon (ſee *Eph.* 3. 7. ὃ ἐγενόμην Διάκονος). But, if this Father or any elſe from ſuch places would conclude, that there was no Church-Officer ſuperior in the Apoſtle's times to theſe, who were then called promiſcuouſly Biſhops and Presbyters, the Texts produced prove it not, no more than *Eph.* 3. 7. proveth, that there was no Church-Officer then higher than a Deacon; or the ſaying, that *Homo* is *Corpus*, proveth, that every *body* is of equal Dignity with a man. Certainly, *Peter* and *John* had a ſuperior Authority to thoſe, who were then called, ſometimes Presbyters, ſometimes Biſhops; and ſo had *James* and *Mark*, &c, this Father being Judge: (ſee before §. 42. *n.* 2.——§. 76. *n.* 2.): and ſo had *Timothy* and *Titus*, the Presbyterian being judge (ſee before §. 73.)

§. 134. 3. 3ly. This Father ſeemeth not to have an intention to equal Presbyters Originally with Biſhops in every thing; as △ not in Ordination: for in the ſame Epiſtle in equalling them he ſaith; *Quid enim facit, exceptâ ordinatione, Epiſcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?* and △ not in their Office univerſally ‖, for in the ſame Epiſtle he putteth three ſubordinate degrees of Clergy, and that *ex traditione Apoſtolicâ*, as hath been urged but now: only he would equal them (as alſo *Chryſoſtom* doth, ſee §. 65. *n.* 9.) in ſome part of Juriſdiction; in the free and independent exerciſe of their Function, preaching, baptizing, &c; and in their common Conſultations and care-taking, (joined together in Council,) for the Government of the Church, as we may perceive by thoſe Phraſes of his, in his Comment in *Tit.* 1. 1. —— *Quos quiſque baptizaverat, ſuos putabat.* —(compare the Quotation out of this Father, *contra Lucifer.* before §. 93. *n.* 1. and that in *Ep. ad Nepot.* §. 63. *n.* 2.)—— *Æqualiter inter plures Eccleſiæ cura diviſa,—& communi Presbyterorum conſilio gubernatæ Eccleſiæ* (probably alluding to *Act.*

‖ *See* Fr. *à* S. Clarâ *Apol. Epiſcop.* p. 107.

Act. 15. 6. *convenerunt Apostoli & Presbyteri de verbo hoc*) ——afterward —— *ad unum omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertinebat: viz.* to avoid Schisms by disagreement in the Counsels of many. And perhaps this might be some motive to draw such expressions from that Father, because that he was aggrieved with *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*'s exercising his jurisdiction over him, when living at *Bethleem* in his Dioceſs, further, than he thought it justly might be extended. When as in his Ordination the Father had made this exception (probably, for the greater liberty of his Studies and solitary Life), Not to be restrained to the Service of any particular Church. Neither, in the Monasteries, wherein he lived, would he be strictly tied to the Sacerdotal Functions See *Baron. A. D.* 378. *Hieron. Ep.* 61. *ad Pammachium.* This Comment will well accord all S. *Jerom*'s expressions; Both, that Bishops are *Traditio Apostolica*; and, that they are *Magis consuetudine, quàm dispositionis Dominicæ* [or (if you will) *Apostolicæ*] *veritate* [*i. e.* as to some things now appropriated to Bishops] *Presbyteris Majores.* But be this as it will; which I say more to defend S. *Jerom*'s credit, than the present cause.

§. 135. n. 1. 4. 4ly. It is worth your noting, that these men desert the same *Hierom* in the Conclusion, whom they assume for a Patron of their Cause. Which Father, take him at the lowest, howsoever he deduceth the Original of Episcopacy, yet both maketh it, * to be necessary in the Church, for that effect, which most procureth the Church's happiness; *ad tollenda schismata*; and * to be established by the whole uniform Authority of the Church; *toto orbe decretum*; and also, after the variety of times and manners experienced in almost 400. years, until his own days, he still approveth it; and so the Church following hath done for 1100 years, till 1500, without any Persons considerable opening their mouth against it. And is it not now too late for the discontented to seek to reverse so *Universal* a *Decree?* S. *Jerom* then, if (as the Presbyterian urgeth him,) he maketh not Episco-

Epiſcopacy of Apoſtolical Conſtitution, he maketh it, conſidering the times which enſued, ſomething better (as to thoſe times) than the Apoſtolical Conſtitution; and he maketh it alſo neceſſary to be obſerved by each part, becauſe *decreed by the whole*; and for ever to be retained, for the ſame reaſon, for which it was at firſt ſet up: viz. *for repelling Schiſms*; unleſs perhaps the nonliableneſs of the preſent times to Schiſms may make Biſhops ſeem now needleſs. But, can they plead this, whoſe eyes have beheld ſuch a diſtracted and torn Body, as *England* hath been ſince 1641. after the removal of Epiſcopacy? Let them take and eſpouſe S. *Jerom*'s Judgment, ſo they take it all together, and unmangled, and Epiſcopacy ſhall live in peace; and all, unanimous, confeſs the neceſſity of it, whilſt they diſpute the Original.

As for *Iſidore* I find him, *l.* 2 *c.* 5. ſaying thus.—— *Apoſtolis decedentibus ſucceſſerunt Epiſcopi; qui ſunt conſtituti per totum mundum in ſedibus Apoſtolorum.*—— and afterward.—— *Quo loco contemplari oportet*, Aaron ſummum Sacerdotem, *id eſt*, Epiſcopum *fuiſſe*; *filios ejus Presbyterorum figuram præmonſtraſſe.* Neither doth any thing in his ſeventh Chapter urged by them contradict theſe. Such therefore as *Aaron* and his Sons were in the Old, ſuch he eſteemed the Biſhops and Presbyters to be in the New, Teſtament. But *Aaron* had as Divine an Original, and as primary an Authority, as his Sons, under the Old Teſtament: and again the Apoſtles had as primary an Authority, as the Seventy, or any other inferior Church-Officers under the New Teſtament: therefore *Iſidore*, here, in making the Biſhops the Antitypes of *Aaron*, and the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, thought theſe, compared with Presbyters, to have the like divine Original; and not to have been erected afterward only by an Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution. Again; in the ſame ſeventh Chapter, in urging the Apoſtles including of Presbyters under the name of Biſhops, (in the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and

§. 135. *n.* 2.

to

to the *Philippians*. c. 1. v. 1.) *Iſidore* ſaith not; that Biſhops and Presbyters were then one and the ſame degree, but that, under that name, *ſecundus primo conjunctus eſt Gradus*. His words are —— *Apoſtolus de Presbyteris tacuit, quia eos in Epiſcoporum nomine comprehendit; ſecundus enim primo conjunctus eſt gradus.*

§. 136. R. to ω. To ω. See what is ſaid before §. 76. *n.* 1. Firſt, that Commentator (whoever he was) maketh *Timothy* to be *primus Presbyter* at *Epheſus*, and other ſingle Perſons to be Succeſſors to him in that Office; and aſcribeth, to him and them, modern Epiſcopal Authority (ſee before §. 57. *Neque enim fas eſt*, &c.) Now, the Presbyterians deny ſuch Authority to the prime Presbyters, which they affirm *Timothy*, *only extraordinarily*, to have had, elſe all were accorded; ſave, that they will call this ſuperior Governor, *prime Presbyter*; others, *Biſhop*. 2ly. This is the only Author (an uncertain one, not *Ambroſe*) in all Antiquity, that I have ſeen produced, (for the Treatiſe, in S. *Auſtin* Quæſt. *ex utroque Teſtamento*, where a *primus Presbyter* is mentioned, Quæſt. 101. is imputed alſo to this ſame Author), who mentioneth a *prime Presbyter*, and the Succeſſion of the Senior Presbyter in his place. 3ly. What he ſaith of the Succeſſion of the Senior (though it little concerns our matter) is contrary to what Hiſtory delivers. For, to omit our Saviour's advancing *Peter* above his Elder, and firſt called, Brother *Andrew*, *Matthias* was aſſumed to the Apoſtleſhip, not by Seniority, but election of Lot. So the Deacons (*Act.* 6.) not choſen by Seniority, but by their worth. *James* the juſt made Biſhop, or prime Presbyter (if you will) of *Jeruſalem*, not from his Seniority, but as being our Lord's near Kinſman, (*Euſeb.* l. 2. c. 1.) The immediate Succeſſors of *Mark* came not in by Seniority, but Election, (See before §. 76. *n.* 2.). Laſtly, this is ſufficiently confeſſed by *Blondel* in the ambitious ſtanding for Biſhopricks, that was in thoſe days, (ſee before §. 79. *n.* 1) which would

would not have been, if the Senior ſtill were preferred. Again; ſeeing that this Author maketh *Timothy* ſuch a one, as to the altitude of whoſe Authority they will by no means admit other prime Presbyters; (for this were admitting Biſhops,) if upon this they ſhall acknowledge *Timothy* and ſuch like, (as *James*, *Mark*, &c.) to have been prime Presbyters, (as *Chamier* doth, ſee before §. 76. *n.* 3.), and then ſay; that theſe firſt prime Presbyters were inveſted indeed with a greater Authority [*Ordination and cenſures*], but the prime Presbyters, that ſucceeded them, with a leſs, [viz. *Preſidency and Moderatorſhip*], I pray you note; that 'tis only till *A. D.* 140. (that is, for the ſpace of ſome forty years) that they can ſay this: for after 140. they confeſs, the prime Presbyters appear inveſted with *Timothy*'s Authority again: And then, how irrational is this, when, finding *Timothy* and others inſtalled in ſuch Authority, and finding again Succeſſors after ſo few years poſſeſſed of the ſame, to degrade and depreſs the intercedent prime Presbyters from the ſame Power, upon no ſtrength, that I know, ſave that of a negative Argument; becauſe Hiſtory mentioneth not every prime Presbyter, and his particular Power. To what follows in that Commentator, concerning Presbyter's Conſignation, ſee what is ſaid before §. 68. *n.* 2.

§. 137. R. to *aa*[1].

To *aa*[1]. That the Ordination of Biſhops, long before the times of *Damaſus*, and of this Commentator, was diſtinct from that of a Presbyter, and performed by a new impoſition of hands; *of hands*, of Biſhops only and not Presbyters, ſee what is ſaid before §. 42. *n.* 3. and what is ſaid particularly by this Commentator himſelf, §. 57. *Neque enim fas erat* (ſaith he) *ut inferior ordinaret majorem.* Here only he ſaith; that, the Ordination, or neceſſary qualifications of both theſe, that is, *quoad Sacerdotium*, (*uterque enim Sacerdos eſt*, as he expoundeth himſelf), being the ſame, the Apoſtle having deſcribed the one, omitteth the other. As for

the qualifications of a Bishop, *quà* Bishop; the Rules given, (throughout the whole Epistle), to *Timothy* declare them.

R. to aa[2]. To aa[2]. [1] Instead of *Consecrat* here, we read in the same Author discoursing elsewhere (in *Ephes.* 4. 11.) ‖ *V.* §. 76. *n.* 1. of the same subject, *Consignat*, ‖ and the nearness of the words would make one think this were a mistake of the Scribe. [2] But be it, *Consecrat*, it cannot signifie Ordaining. For then we may presume this Author would have used the word *Ordinat* rather; For in the same place where this thing is mentioned. He calls the constituting of Bishops Ordination, see before §. 57. —— *Quemadmodum Episcopum ordinet, ostendit*; where he also saith of Presbyters; —— *Fas non est, ut inferior ordinaret majorem.* Or, at least, it would have been, not *Consecrat Presbyter*; but *Consecrant Presbyteri*, according to S. *Paul*'s *Presbyterium*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Ordinations being not usually transacted but at solemn meetings of the Clergy; nor such hast of these Ordinations, but that, in so weighty a matter, the Presbyter might well attend the Bishop's return; the Apostle also having commanded, that hands, thus, should be laid on none hastily. But, to put all out of doubt, it is clear in the case of *Coluthus* (mentioned before §. 65. *n.* 8.) that Presbyters in *Egypt*, before this *Hilarius* his time, were not permitted to ordain, on any pretence. [3] If, *consecrat*, is not a mistake for, *consignat*, I suppose both the words aim at the same thing, and by this is meant the Consecration of the *Chrisme* used in Consignation or Confirmation; an Act belonging properly to the Bishop (see before §. 66. *n.* 2. the quotation out of *Innocent* 1.) But, it seems, in *Egypt*, that this was done by Presbyters, in the Bishop's absence. Of this or some other of those Consecrations belonging to the Bishop (mentioned before §. 64.) it must be meant. See *Blondel Apol.* p. 57. and 61. ——But, whatever is meant by it, it cannot be understood of Consecrating the Eucharist; which,

si

ſi deerat Epiſcopus, was done then by a Presbyter, not only in *Alexandria* and *Egypt*, but all the World over.

To ℭℭ. Concerning both the Presbytery and the Laity anciently conſulted with by the Biſhop in many Church-affairs, and eſpecially in the election of Officers, ſee what is ſaid above §. 69. *n.* 2. §. 65. *n.* 1. and more neceſſary, in thoſe times, was the People's conſent and aſſiſtance, when the Prince was an Enemy, and nothing could be done contrary to the People's will. Which of theſe, the Seniors Eccleſiaſtick, or Laick, or both, are here meant, it much matters not; perhaps Laicks are here underſtood, becauſe he ſeemeth to intimate them not much Learned. Biſhops may conſult with, and uſe the advice of, whom they pleaſe; and of the more, the better: and their doing all things alone, without conſulting others, may be very culpable. §. 138. R. to ℭℭ.

To ℸℸ. See what is ſaid before §. 66. *n.* 4. That the Presbyters are not removed to ſo great a diſtance from the Biſhops, but that, with S *Chryſoſtom*, it is confeſſed; *illis etiam Eccleſiæ curam eſſe permiſſam*, See the third *Conceſſion* §. 102. *n.* 1. —Again; that the Presbyters come not ſo cloſe to the Biſhops, nor the *ferè* is intended to pinch ſo near, but, that the Biſhops have a ſuperior Authority, and that from Apoſtolical Conſtitution; and that they have other Acts alſo proper to them, which are not to the Presbytery, beſides Ordination (as Confirmation for one), See before the Teſtimonies of this ſame Father §. 55. §. 65. *n.* 9. —And what is ſaid, in this place, of S. *Chryſoſtom* ſuits alſo to that of S. *Jerom* §. 76. *n.* 2. [*Quid enim facit exceptâ ordinatione, Epiſcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?*] if you compare with it his Teſtimony §. 60. §. 65. *n.* 9. §. 139. R. *to* ℸℸ.

To ℵℵ. That S. *Auſtin* held Biſhops placed in the Church by Apoſtolical Inſtitution, ſuperior in Authority to Presbyters, See his Teſtimonies before §. 59. §. 140. R. to ℵℵ.

‖ *Lib. de Hæresibus.*

§. 59. And his condemning *Aerius* ‖; * for saying, *Presbyterum ab Episcopo nullâ differentiâ debere discerni* (i. e. * for saying, *Episcopatum non esse majorem Presbyterio*, according to *Aerius* his words in *Epiphanius*, *Unus honor*, *una dignitas*) sufficiently witnesseth the same ‖. He intends not therefore here, a majority of Authority to be acquired only *per usum Ecclesiæ*, but a certain majority of Titles (*vocabula honorum*, as he calls them) which Ecclesiastical Custom had appropriated to Bishops much more high and splendid, than were given to Presbyters in, his, or to Bishops in the primitive times: As S. *Hierom* stileth him in his Superscriptions, *Beatissimus Papa* Augustinus; and, in speaking to him, otherwhile useth the terms of *Sanctitas tua*, *Beatitudo tua*, &c. And lastly perhaps, amongst other Titles, he hath an eye also to that Title of *Episcopus*: which, at first common to all Presbyters, became afterward, *ex usu Ecclesiæ*, appropriated to the Superior Church-Governours only, wherein also he seems to mitigate his Speech to what S. *Jerom*'s temper could bear, whose Sentiments on this matter were not unknown to S. *Austin*, who had read his Comments on S. *Paul*'s Epistles (see *Aug. Ep.* 8. *ad Hieron.*), and so that place on *Tit.* c. 1. ‖, so much urged by the Presbyterians.

‖ *V. Sect.* 71.

‖ *V. Sect.* 76. *n.* 2.

§. 141.

To ee. All the Church-Historians agree in this, that single Persons, not Presbyteries, had the supream Government of the several Churches: Of those particular Persons, (who are named), which governed first; or whether some, at all; is sometimes disputed, as it is also in the Chronicles of Kings; without questioning hence; whether such Nations had Kingly Government. See the *King's* last answer, *Wight.* p. 25.

R. to ee.

See Sect. 42. *n.* 2. &c.

§. 142.

To ff. The Authority of these Persons above the rest is proved; not only their priority.

R. to ff.

§. 143.

To nn. The practice of former times hath been shewed to be agreeable to the later Father's expressions of them. See the *King's* last answer, p. 26.

R. to nn.

To

To θθ. This is but, with a compaſs of words, to ſay, that the *Fathers* mis-related the times before them; and that the Presbyterians will not ſtand to their Authority. Why then quote they, where they find, the *Fathers* for them? §. 144. R. to θθ.

To κκ. [1] Some Errors and Corruptions ſhewed in Antiquity inferr not, that nothing is certain therein, nothing ſincere. [2] None of the matters they name was then ſo univerſally received or practiſed, as Epiſcopacy was. [The *Millenary* Doctrine was never ' univerſal. *Juſtin Martyr* acknowledged ſome not to ' hold it, though he and his Party (perhaps the more ' numerous,) judged thoſe others not Orthodox. The ' contrary to it, as taken in ſome ſenſe, was the more ' publick Doctrine very anciently in the Church; in ' the days of S. *Auſtin*, of S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, of S. *Jerom*, ' of S. *Damaſus*. (See S. *Jerom. in* Mat. l. 3. c. 19.—— ' and l. 18. *in Eſaiam*——*Greg. Nyſſen. Ep. Euſtochiæ* & ' *Ambroſiæ* ——*Euſeb.* l. 7. c. 22, 23, 24. (The Church ' neither of former nor of latter times hath decreed, or ' concluded, any thing againſt it, as, * ſoberly under- ' ſtood: (See S. *Auguſt.* de Civ. l. 20. c. 7.—S. *Hierom* ' in *Jeremiam* c. 20.), and, * not taken for a voluptu- ' ous living of Chriſt and his Saints here on Earth for a ' thouſand years in all ſenſual and carnal Delights; the ' opinion only of *Cerinthus* and ſome others anciently ac- ' counted Hereticks.—— ' —— Of the Communion of *Infants* there was never any ' abſolute neceſſity held (at leaſt by the chiefeſt of the ' Church, S. *Auſtin* and others), ſave only, as the Eu- ' chariſt was then ordinarily joined with, and made an ' Appendix of, Baptiſm; the neceſſity of which ' Baptiſm they aſſerted againſt the *Pelagians*. Neither ' can there be ſhewed in Antiquity any ſuch Tenet as ' this; that thoſe who were already baptized and died ' uncommunicated, could not be ſaved, the effect of ' which Communion, where it could not be received, ' they held to be ſupplied in Baptiſm, incorporating us ' ſpiritually ' §. 145. R. to κκ.

'spiritually into Christ, and fulfilling the Text *Joh. 6.* '54.—See S. *Jerom adverſ. Luciferianos.*—*Si ad Epiſ-* 'copi tantùm imprecationem, &c. —S. *Aug. de peccat. merit.* 'l. 2. c. 28.—l. 3. c. 4.—S. *Innocent* Synodo *Milevitanæ.* '—S. *Baſil*'s four Cuſtoms are neither Errors, nor Cor-'ruptions: nor held to be ſo, by judicious *Proteſtants*; 'ſome of theſe practiſed by them, others omitted not as 'unlawful, but as not neceſſary, or, for their times, not 'convenient. Now, what former Cuſtoms may be 'changed, and by whom, ſee before §. 61. *n.* 5. and §. 36. '*n.* 2.—and below §. 199.]

§. 146. R. to ʌ. To ʌ. Things grounded upon Prudence, not Scripture, are not for this to be rejected. Yet Epiſcopacy grounded on Scripture, See before §. 38.—§. 40. The effectualneſs, and neceſſity, of Epiſcopacy *ad tollendum ſchiſmata* hath ſufficiently appeared in this Nation ſince *A. D.* 1641, Had neither reaſon, nor former experience, made it good.

§. 147. R. to ɯ. To ɯ. They are miſtaken in thinking this alwaysgranted *Prime Patriarch* of the Church Catholick, *Antichriſt.*

§. 148. R. to vv. To vv. There is a certain neceſſity (*ad tollendum Schiſmata, &c.*) * of ſetting up one Archbiſhop over many Biſhops, which was done in or near the Apoſtolick times (ſee before §. 61.): and * of ſetting up one Patriarch over many Archbiſhops; and * of ſetting up one Patriarch over all the reſt of the Patriarchs; which is granted by all to have been done in ancient times; and certainly not without cauſe. *A neceſſity*, I ſay; as to the *melius eſſe* of the Church; though perhaps, of ſetting up all theſe not the ſame neceſſity, as to all times.

§. 149. R. to oo. To oo. Let them then ſay ſo plainly to the World: and let D. *Blondel* leave off his pretence to Antiquity. And then, let all thoſe, who hear them ſay ſo; and who recite *Credo ſanctam Eccleſiam Catholicam* in their Creed, conſider; whether it is ſafeſt to follow them, who deſert the Fathers of this Church.

To

To ϖϖ. See what is ſaid to xx. What ſome one Perſon or Church hath affirmed for Apoſtolical Tradition, but is contradicted by the reſt, is not to be produced, as affirmed by the whole; nor as having as large a Teſtimony from thence, as Epiſcopacy. §. 150. R. to ϖϖ.

To ϱϱ. We have the Editions of Fathers ancienter than ſuch Index *Expurgatorius*, the Authorities urged are to be found in them. §. 151. R. to ϱϱ.

To σσ. That Learned Gentleman hath ſince ſeen and corrected his Error. §. 152. R. to σσ.

To ττ. All thoſe Councils, which have acknowledged a ſuperior Authority in Biſhops over Presbyters, for Ordination, or other Eccleſiaſtical Acts (of which ſee ſeveral Canons quoted §. 65. *n.* 2. and elſewhere) have condemned *Aerianiſm.* Though; He and his Followers ſuddenly vaniſhing, and his Errors withering preſently, and taking no root, in the interval between the convening of the ſecond and of the third General Council, hence it is, that no Council hath taken notice, or condemned the Perſon of *Aerius.* But, if no Council had condemned the Opinions that *Aerius* held, why refuſe our Presbyterians to be tried by the Canons of Councils? as they do. See before §. 93. *n.* 1. §. 153. R. to ττ.

To υυ. This Tenent of *Aerius* [the equalling Epiſcopacy with Presbyters] is not to be little regarded, becauſe of ſeveral other Tenents of his that are numbred with it, for erroneous, which are allowed of by ſome *Proteſtants*: But ſeveral of the other Tenents rather to be much regarded, as well as it, and better conſidered by ſuch *Proteſtants*, as allow them. Becauſe theſe Fathers purpoſely writ theſe Books to draw up a Roll of the Doctrines, that were contrary not to their private Opinions, but to the common Tenents, and belief of the Church Catholick: as appeareth both, in the *Prefaces*, and by the *Titles* of the ſaid Books. §. 154. R. to υυ.

This

§. 155. *n.* 1. This being replied to what is there ſaid: Yet, * becauſe *Aerius*, being aſperſed by Antiquity, hath no very good name; and therefore many Presbyterians (though not ours,) think it beſt to diſown him; and * becauſe there are many ſeveral degrees (amongſt that Party), in their oppoſing of Epiſcopacy, I think it neceſſary to give you ſome further account of this matter; that you may ſee, how thoſe of that Party, according to their ſeveral averſion from Epiſcopacy, do cenſure and diſallow one another.

§. 155. *n.* 2. Concerning *Aerius* (whoſe Tenet againſt Biſhops you may review above §. 71, and who was liſted in the Roll of Hereticks by S. *Epiphanius* firſt, and after him by S. *Auſtin*), ſeveral *Presbyterians*, in their own defence, go ſeveral ways. Some acknowledge themſelves of the ſame opinion with *Aerius*; but deny him, in it, to be an Heretick: as the *Aſſembly*-Divines ‖, *Chamier* †, and others. Others grant him an Heretick condemned by Antiquity: but deny themſelves to maintain his Opinion, as D. *Blondel*, *P. du Moulin*, and others. From which Imputation that they may clear themſelves; *Blondel* ſaith (*Preface* to his *Apology* p. 59.) Aerium *hæreticum non habitum ob ſententiam, quæ ei cum* Hieronymo *communis fuit, ſed ob falſum πόϑισμα; ſecedendum ſcilicet eſſe ab iis, qui ullum inter Epiſcopos & Presbyteros conſuetudine Eccleſiaſticâ invectum diſcrimen, quomodocunque admiſerint.* Suitable to whom he reckoned thoſe; *qui Proteſtantes eos,* (Aerii *exemplo,*) *non ferendos eſſe cenſuerint, qui ex veteri conſuetudine Epiſcopos Presbyteris majores vel fecerunt, vel fieri permiſerunt: nec eo proprie nomine urbici Pontificis partes deſeruerint, quod Epiſcopatum ſupra Presbyteratum evexerit, &c. Nec abrogarint Eccleſiaſtici regiminis formam (invectam à Patribus bono ſine) ut per ſe malam & damnabilem, ſed ut humanum inſtitutum adnatis ſenſim corruptelis vitiatum.* He meanwhile freeing thoſe from *Aerianiſm, qui hanc regiminis formam abrogarunt, ut humanum inſtitutum, &c.* Again *P. du Moulin* condemneth *Aerius, ——quòd in re pridem & ubique receptâ, auſus ſit opponere*

‖ *See before Sect.* 93.
† *Cham. de Canone l.* 9. *c.* 12. *Sect.* 15.

Ep. prima Epiſcopo Wintonienſi. *See Epiſt.* 2.

opponere ſeſe conſenſui univerſalis Eccleſiæ: He meanwhile freeing them from *Aerianiſm*, *qui rem, quæ jam, inde à ſæculo Apoſtolis proximo, recepta fuit in Eccleſiâ, ut vitioſam aut improbam non aſpernantes, ſub diversâ politiæ Eccleſiaſticæ formâ vivunt.*

So that, in oppoſing Epiſcopacy, you may diſcover that there are many degrees. The First, To hold, that there is no difference between Biſhops and Presbyters made in Scripture; yet granting, that the Church, upon ſome good reaſons, may advance one above the other. The ſecond, To hold, that, though the Church ſetteth up ſuch Government, yet none are ſo tied to it, that it may not be altered and reduced, in ſome caſe of neceſſity. The third, To hold, That, without any abſolute caſe of neceſſity alſo, it may be abrogated and departed from, as being only an humane Inſtitution, eſpecially when vitiated with ſome adhering Corruptions. The fourth, To hold, * that ſuch Epiſcopacy is a thing contrary to the Scriptures, and to the Divine Inſtitution, which Inſtitution maketh all Presbyters equal; * that it is *res per ſe mala & damnabilis*; * that the Church therefore cannot lawfully eſtabliſh it; nor ought one upon any terms to tolerate it; but to depart from thoſe, that any way admit it. Now, how much of theſe *Aerius* might hold, who can ſay? But the utmoſt that S. *Auſtin* who had his intelligence from *Epiphanius*, relateth of him, is: ——*Presbyterum ab Epiſcopo nullâ differentia debere diſcerni.* And *Epiphanius* condemns him for maintaining no difference between Biſhops and Presbyters in the Scripture; as appears by that Father's Confutation of his Arguments from Scripture. §. 155. n. 3. 1. 2. 3. 4.

In which ſteps of *Aerius* to ſee how far the Presbyterians do tread, we muſt firſt ſearch. Whether they make; or in what ſenſe, they make, the equality of all Presbyters to be *jure divino*. And, to underſtand this more clearly, you muſt know: That, beſides the ſacerdotal Functions granted by all to be *jure* §. 155. n. 4.

divino, and to be our Saviour's perpetual Inſtitution (ſee before §. 39.), there is a diſtinct queſtion concerning the Inſtitution of the Perſons, that are to exerciſe theſe Functions; [*I mean, of preaching, adminiſtring the Sacraments, Ordaining*, &c.]. For our Lord
1. may be ſuppoſed. 1. Either to have inſtituted and inveſted an equal Power in all Presbyters for the diſcharge of all theſe Offices; and this alſo without any liberty, left to the Apoſtles, or Church following, to alter this his Inſtitution, for the ordinary exerciſe and diſcharge thereof, either by way of reſtraint, or of
2. enlargement. 2. Or to have inſtituted a ſuperiority of ſome Presbyters, for ſome of theſe Functions, above the reſt; that, which we call Epiſcopacy; and this again without any liberty left to the Apoſtles, or Church following them, to alter this his Inſtitution. Where you muſt note, before I go further; that it is the ſame thing, if, after our Saviour's departure, the Apoſtles ſhould inſtitute either the firſt or the ſecond of theſe, as immutable for the future. For this would be *jus divinum*, as much, as, if our Saviour himſelf had done it: becauſe it is by his divine and infallible
3. Spirit, that they do it. 3. Or to have inſtituted the forementioned either equalities, or ſuperiority, among Presbyters with a liberty left to the Apoſtles, or to the Church following to alter ſuch Inſtitution, as to the common and ordinary diſcharge thereof, ſo as that there is no neceſſity of either of theſe to be, in whatever times, perpetually, and immutably obſerved. Where note again; that it is the ſame thing with this, if the Apoſtles, who are guided by God's Spirit, do inſtitute either of the aboveſaid matters as things afterwards alterable by the Church. If our Saviour, or his Apoſtles, inſtituted the firſt of theſe, then is equality of Presbyters or Presbytery, *jure divino*, unalterable; and ſo Epiſcopacy *contra jus divinum*. If he or they inſtituted the ſecond, then is Epiſcopacy *jure divino* unalterable; and an equal Presbytery

tery *contra jus divinum.* If our Saviour, or his Apoſtles inſtituted either of theſe, after the third manner; then neither of them taken diſtinctively are *jure divino*, except for the preſent time, but *Eccleſiaſtico*; becauſe the Church afterward freely electeth which of them ſhe will conform to, not tied by God to the one, or to the other.

Now, to apply what hath been ſaid; it ſeems that our modern Engliſh Presbyterians hold an equality of all Presbyters to be *jure divino* after the firſt manner. That it is *jure divino*; they quote *Whitaker*, Biſhop *Jewel*, and others allowing, *Presbyteros jure divino Epiſcopis æquales eſſe. Jus divin. Miniſt. Anglic.* p. 60. 145. Which *jus divinum* again they extend ſo far, as to ſay; *that there is no ſuch Officer in the Church Ordained by Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, as a Biſhop over Presbyters; and that a Biſhop over Presbyters is not a plant of Gods planting.* p. 50. 53. *That they are ſure, that Prelacy hath no Foundation in the Scriptures; and that, as Chriſt in matter of divorce, brought the Jews to the firſt Inſtitution of Marriage, ſo ought they, in the point of Prelacy to reduce Men back to the firſt Inſtitution of Epiſcopacy, and to ſay, as Chriſt, that from the beginning it was not ſo. That it was a good ſaying of* Tertullian. ——*Id adulterum quod poſterius, id verum, quod primum*: That, *Conſuetudo ſine veritate* is *vetuſtas erroris: Antiquity without Truth, a Cypher without a Figure: That, what agreeth with the Authority of divine Scripture, they accept from Antiquity with praiſe, what agreeth not, they refuſe with their leave.*—— *That there were many Corruptions which crept into the Church in the very Infancy of it,* &c. p. 100. ——and ſee what is recited before §. 92. Like things ſaith *Chamier de Pontif.* l. 10. c. 5. ——*Unum reliquis præpoſitum eſſe à bonis viris bono fine, ſed utinam* (ſaith he) *non carnali prudentiâ potiùs, quàm Spiritus ductu.* ——And——*Regimen Eccleſiæ Ariſtocraticum à Chriſto inſtitutum fuiſſe, nec benè ceſſiſſe, execrandam eſſe blaſphemiam; quaſi Chriſtus non ſatis fuerit in futurum providens.*

§. 155. *n.* 5.

And now ſee, whether, by theſe expreſſions and carriage, they do not incur *Blondel's* and *Moulin's* condemned *Aerianiſm*: Whether they do not *opponere ſe conſenſui univerſalis Eccleſiæ*: and that in ſuch a manner, as *aſpernari illum ut vitioſum*, and repugnant to Scripture, rejecting Epiſcopal Government not as inconvenient, or inferior to Presbyterial; but as culpable, and unlawful, and contrary, to *Chriſt's* and his *Apoſtle's* Inſtitution.

§. 155. *n.* 6. This, concerning their holding Presbytery *jure divino*, after the firſt manner, wherein you may ſee, that they make ſuch an oppoſition to Epiſcopacy, as that they fall under *Blondel's* cenſure. But, if they ſhould hold it ſo, only after the third manner; that is, ſo, as that this Presbyterian Government is alterable by the Church; then, the Church's Conſtitution and Surrogation of Epiſcopacy becomes lawful and juſtifiable; and again, in this, they, being a part, may not recede from the whole: ſo that thus, in the changing of Epiſcopacy, if they eſcape Hereſie, in making Epiſcopacy not unlawful, they will fall into Schiſm, in abrogating it againſt Authority.

§. 155. *n.* 7. But laſtly; △ if Epiſcopacy happen to be *jure divino*, (ſee Biſhop *Andrews* his anſwers to *Moulin*), either by the Inſtitution of our *Saviour*: who founded not the Government of the Church in a parity at firſt, as is amply ſhewed before §. 12. &c; but made amongſt Presbyters (for ſuch alſo the Apoſtles themſelves were, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1.——2 *Jo.* 1.) ſome ſuperior, ſome 'inferior: [See *Eph.* 4 11. *Chriſt gave ſome Apo-* 'ſtles, *ſome Prophets.*——And 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *God con-* 'ſtituted *in the Church, firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets.*— 'And ſo *Mat.* 10.—Chriſt ſent forth Twelve Diſciples 'of the firſt rank,—and *Luke* 10. ſix times twelve, 'in all ſeventy two, of a ſecond rank, the Apoſtles 'being the Fore-fathers and exemplars of Biſhops, the 'ſeventy two, of Presbyters, in the following times 'of the Church; as the Fathers underſtood them,

'ſee

ſee before §. 64.—— and §. 66. *n.* 3. and *Concil. Neocæſarienſe* c. 13.] ' Or, △ if Epiſcopacy happen to be *jure divino* by the Inſtitution of his *Apoſtles* (which is all one) guided by his Spirit: Who, again, advanced *Timothy*, *Titus*, *James*, *Mark*, &c, above the reſt of the Presbyters, as hath been amply ſhewed before §. 38, *&c*: If, I ſay, Epiſcopacy be by one of theſe two ways *jure divino* unalterable, as the former Church univerſally underſtood it to be, and hath conſtantly obeyed this Apoſtolick Order in her practice; Then, ſuppoſing that we will ſtand to *P. du Moulin*'s judgment, all that oppoſe Epiſcopacy in ſuch manner, as the *Presbyterians* do, are no leſs, than *Hereticks*. For thus he, Ep. 3. to Biſhop *Andrews*, to ſhew to this Biſhop, the dangerous conſequence of his maintaining Epiſcopacy to be *jure divino*, as the Biſhop had told him, that he ought to maintain it.—*Nec potui dicere primatum Epiſcoporum eſſe juris divini, quin Eccleſiis noſtris* notam hæreſeos *inurerem. Enimverò obſirmare animum adverſus ea, quæ, ſunt juris divini, & Deo jubenti pertinaciter refragari, planè eſt hæreſis, ſive id fidem attingat ſive diſciplinam.* Where he ſeemeth to confeſs, his Church *obſirmare animum adverſus Epiſcopatum*, and *ei pertinaciter refragari*. If you would know the *Biſhops* anſwer, after he had ſeemed, to *Moulin*, to have given the tranſmarine Churches ſuch a mortal wound; He, loth to proſecute him to the uttermoſt, thus lenifies the matter.—*Non culpâ eorum Epiſcopatum abeſſe, ſed injuriâ temporum* [namely their *King* not permitting them Biſhops]. Again; *eos rem retinere ſine titulo* [a thing, I trow, they will not own] *Nam &* Calvinum *&* Bezam, *dum vixerunt, quid fuiſſe, niſi abolito nomine, reipsâ Epiſcopos?* ——And after, concerning *Aerius*, the ſame *Biſhop*, in his bitter-ſweet Language goeth on thus —— *Relatum inter hæreticos* Aerium, (*& meritò*), *qui* Epiphanio *credat, vel* Philaſtrio, *vel* Auguſtino, *neceſſe eſt fateatur. Et tu, qui damnas* Aerium, *quo nomine damnas? An, quod ſe oppoſuerit conſenſui univerſalis Eccleſiæ? Idem qui ſentit, an non itidem ſe*

opponit,

opponit, ac eo nomine damnandus erit? Sed ſicubi erratum, dum nè obſirmato animo, alia longè cauſa ejus, qui ſentit quod ſenſit Aerius; *alia* Aerii. —— *Abſit modo animus obſirmatus & pertinax, hæreſis non erit.* But firſt, theſe excuſes, if they fit the *French*, yet are not current for our *Engliſh*, *Presbyterians*; but that they will ſtill, in this Biſhop's Judgment, be guilty of Hereſie; * becauſe *non injuriâ temporum abeſt illis Epiſcopatus, ſed culpâ ſuâ*; the good *King* permitting, promoting, dying for, Epiſcopacy; and * becauſe *illis non abeſt animus obſirmatus* in this matter. 2. But neither ſitteth it the *French* in *Moulin*'s judgment, who, in his words now cited, ſeemeth to affirm the contrary.—*Non potui, &c. quin Eccleſiis Noſtris notam hæreſeos inurerem.* Why? *Nam obſirmare animum, &c, planè eſt hæreſis.*

§. 155. n. 8. This I had to ſay concerning *Aerianiſm*. From which though I cannot free the *Presbyterian*; yet ſee I no reaſon, why S. *Hierom* ſhould be ſo confidently enrolled in the ſame Family. For 1. though in his Comment upon *Titus*, and Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, he ſeemeth to expound ſome Scriptures in the ſame manner, as *Aerius* (who was condemned for, and confuted in, this by *Epiphanius*); and deriveth not Epiſcopacy from the prime Inſtitution, of our Saviour, or (as ſome think) of his *Apoſtles*: Yet elſewhere he clearly acknowledgeth, at leaſt in their latter times, an Apoſtolical Inſtitution thereof ‖; from thence perpetually obſerved in the Church; as is ſhewed before in anſwer to †. §. 131. And, if our Saviour at firſt inſtituted ſuch a Presbyterial Parity, yet S. *Jerom* grants this eſtabliſhment temporary and ſuch, as that it was, *pro ratione temporum*, lawfully mutable into a Subordination. 2ly. He allows of, and ſubmits to, ſuch a change, confeſſing it not only lawful, but (for the times) neceſſary: much contrary to *Aerius* his Doctrine.—*Presbyterum ab Epiſcopo nullâ differentiâ debere diſcerni.* 3ly. Where he ſpeaketh moſt for a Parity, he expreſly nameth Ordination as incompetent to Presbyters. See his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*.

1.

‖ See before, Sect. 60.

2.

3.

Neither

Neither can the *Presbyterian* faſten *Aerianiſm* upon him without making him contradict himſelf in the ſelf-ſame diſcourſe; out of which is an eminent paſſage quoted for *Epiſcopacy* to be an *Apoſtolical Tradition.* See before §. 60. *Hierom*'s Epiſtle *ad Evagrium.*

CHAP. V.

§. 156. R. to ¶¶. R. to their Objections concerning Ordination by Presbyters anciently allowed, practiſed.

TO ¶¶. Theſe Writers (to ſhew what favour, they may, to the Reformed abroad), do indeed aſſert an original and intrinſecal Power to ordain, in Presbyters. But then they hold this Power, ſoon after received, to have been reſtrained by Apoſtolical Conſtitution: And reſtrained, not for ſome time, but in *perpetuum*, for any ordinary exerciſe thereof; except only in ſome caſes of neceſſity. Such as theſe: If all the Biſhops in the World ſhould be deſtroyed, or dead. Or, yet living, ſhould all turn Hereticks; or Perſecutors of the Truth; and refuſe to ordain any, who will not ſubſcribe their Errors. Or if, the Biſhops remaining blameleſs, ſome Chriſtians, and their Miniſters (ſuppoſe, in ſome deſerted Iſland) ſhould be excluded from all acceſs unto Biſhops. Theſe are the caſes wherein theſe Writers do ſet free the *Presbyter's* Power of Ordination, otherwiſe ſuſpended for ever (ſay they) by the *Apoſtles.* See *Downham*, *Maſon*, *Field*, in the ſame places, where the Presbyterians quote them. ‖

‖ Downh. *Defence of conſecrat. ſect.*--- Maſon *def. of Ord.* p. 168. 171.--- Field. l. 3. c. 39.

§. 157. 1.

But here firſt I ſee little reaſon, why theſe Authors (for other judicious Proteſtants are of a contrary opinion, ſee *Andrew*'s *Reſponſ.* to *Moulin*) ſhould affirm the Apoſtolical Conſtitution in this matter of committing Ordination to Biſhops not perpetual, but releaſeable, in ſome accidents, which they put as caſes of neceſſity, if we compare what they ſay elſewhere of the Original Inſtitution of Biſhops. For examining of which, take *Maſon*,

Mason, if you please; the Author, whose judgment the Presbyterians most often refer to. He (in his Defence of Ord. p. 132, 133.) holds, *the preheminence of Bishops as to Ordination, &c, to be plentifully proved in Scripture, and forasmuch* (saith he) *as the end, and use of their Office is perpetual, therefore the Function and Office it self must likewise be perpetual* [to them and to their Successors]. Again he saith, *that the calling of Bishops is approved by the mouth of Christ himself*; [more], *That they are sent from him, and their vocation by him authorized.* And p. 163. *that they are, the Ordinance of the Apostles, whereunto they were directed by God's Spirit, even by the Spirit of Prophecy; and* (*consequently*) *the Ordinance of God.* Now I urge against him, what *Blondel* doth upon the same supposition (see before §. 94. *n.* 11.). ***Nulli potestas est supra ordinationem divinam, ut quod illius interdicto vetitum est*** [as the Apostles, by God's Spirit, committing Ordination to Bishops, forbad it to other Presbyters] *permittat.* And—***Nulla incumbere necessitas potest, quæ Dei voluntate major est.***

§. 158. There is indeed an absolute necessity which voids all Law, and Fault; such as this: if a Presbyter cannot *de facto* but ordain, which voids all Law prohibiting such Ordination. But the cases of necessity they urge to infringe *this Ordinance of God* (as *Mason* calls it) are hypothetical only, thus: *Either a single Presbyter must ordain; or such a Person cannot be ordained.*—Or; *Either a Presbyter must ordain; or, in such a place or Country, there can be no Ordination.* But here, since there are (as you may observe) two necessities to take our choice of, we ought to incur that, which conforms to God's former order, and leave future events to his Providence. When, in defect of Clergy, either a Lay-man must consecrate the Eucharist, or some Christians be destitute of the Communion, a Lay-man may not therefore consecrate: nor the Lay-man confirmed, when no Clergy to be had, confirm others. If *such* necessities be admitted to void Ordinances, what will not be liable to the like mutability?

But

§. 159. 2. But 2ly. To let this paſs: Theſe Author's permiſſion of Changing this Apoſtolical form of Government upon the forenamed caſes of neceſſity, were it granted lawful, will little defend and warrant the Presbyterian cauſe, either for the paſt, or for the preſent, times, to ſet up another form inſtead thereof.

§. 160. 1. For firſt it is clear: that all Biſhops are not, hitherto, ceaſed. 2. Nor yet inacceſſible by the *Presbyterians*, who inhabit no deſerted Iſland, nor are ſevered from all commerce with Biſhops. 3. Nor yet all the Biſhops Hereticks and perſecuters of the Truth, even in the Presbyterian's judgment; (Not a few of whom here in *England* received their ordinations from our Biſhops; and *Calvin* and *Beza*, even whilſt themſelves (Presbyters) ordained Presbyters at *Geneva*, yet approved and commended our *Engliſh Biſhops* at the beginning of the Reformation in *Edward the ſixth's* days; and had *Dudithius*, *Vergerius*, and others, fellow-converts nearer home, from whom they might have received Orders.) Nor, I ſuppoſe, are our preſent *Presbyterians* more rigid than *Calvin*; nor our preſent *Engliſh Biſhops* leſs Orthodox, than K. *Edward's*.

See Calv. Epiſtles to Cranmer and Ridley. — Beza de grad. miniſt. c. 18. Sect. 3.

§. 161. 4. But ſuppoſe, that all Biſhops were Hereticks, in their account; yet, unleſs they be ſo indeed, there is no caſe of neceſſity ſtill; and, in ſuch a matter concerning hereſy, whether the Biſhops be ſuch or no, ſurely the proper Judge is, not a ſmall part againſt the whole; ſome few inferiors againſt all ſuperiors; but the Church, and her Councils: and ſo Biſhops, (the Church's Governors, of whom Councils only, or chiefly, conſiſt) will be the lawful Judge thereof. Elſe, all things are put in a confuſion, if Presbyters may judge firſt, when their Biſhops are not right; and then lay hands on one another to promote, for the Church's Governors themſelves. If the Biſhops may not judge *what is hereſy*, when accuſed of it, ſurely much leſs may the Presbyters, the accuſers: Neither may the Laity judge ſuch an *Eccleſiaſtical* matter; and ſo the right of

judging this, is thus returned to the Biſhops; who leave not the Chair for deciding of the controverſy, ſo often as they accuſe, or are accuſed by others of hereſy. The *Arians* accuſed the *Anti-Arian* Biſhops of their corrupting of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and of bringing in new *language* into the Church, yet were the *Arians* allowed no other Judges ſave theſe, in the Council of *Nice*; and this a judgment approved by the Presbyterians. But, admit the inferior Clergy to be the Judges in theſe matters concerning their Biſhops, yet how inconſiderable a party of Presbyters are the *Presbyterian* Presbyters? In the poſſibility therefore of ſuch a caſe of neceſſity, if it hapned ſometimes, yet the Presbyters are not the right Judges thereof; nor the major part of Presbyters, *Presbyterians*.

ὁμοούσιον

Sect. 162. 5. But 5ly. ſuch caſe of neceſſity as this, and the others, which theſe authors mention (excepting that of inhabiting a deſerted Iſland) cannot be at all. For it cannot be, that all the Biſhops in the World, of whom chiefly conſiſt thoſe Councils, which our Saviour hath left to guide his Church, and to whom he hath promiſed his perpetual aſſiſtance (the ground why we yield obedience to the determinations of the *Nicene*, and other, lawful General Councils, of which ſee before *Sect. 36. n. 2.*) * ſhould either periſh and not be at all, *i. e. that the Church ſhould have no ſuch guides*; * or ſhould be all hereticks and perſecuters of the truth; *i. e. that the Church ſhould have theſe as falſe guides*; whom ſhe hath been always taught to acknowledge for her chief paſtors, and that ſhe ought to obey them in caſe of any contradiction between theſe, and thoſe, who are her under-teachers, by their ordination and licenſe. So that, ſome of theſe failing (as they may); yet thoſe, who ſeek *Ordination*, may ſtill repair to ſome others of them, Orthodox. And, if theſe, being ſued-to, do refuſe to admit them, they may not therefore ſet up others, by whom they may be ordained, but ought, * to correct thoſe faults or errors, for which they are rejected

rejected by the right Ordainers; and rather* to ſuſpect themſelves unfit for the one; than theſe for the other.

But yet further 6ly. If all Biſhops be thus, only at ſome time, and not always, hereticks, and perſecuters; then, when ſome of theſe return to be Orthodox, at that time Ordination muſt return again to the Biſhops: for a practice that is grounded only on a caſe of neceſſity, is allowed no longer, than the neceſſity laſts. And thus Dr. *Field* p. 157. —— *For Presbyters to ordain, not being urged, by extream neceſſity, cannot be excuſed*, &c. Therefore, ſo ſoon as there were any Biſhops of the reformed Opinions, ſo ſoon ceaſed Presbyterian Ordination to be lawful, in the judgment of theſe (forenamed) Writers. And ſuch reformed Biſhops there were even in *Calvin*'s days; and thoſe by him approved; (ſee before §. 160.). And now I leave you to conſider, how well theſe Writers have defended the Presbyterian cauſe: ▵ When as the tranſmarine Presbyterians, at leaſt thoſe of *France*, not only *extra caſum neceſſitatis*, continue ſuch Ordination by ſingle Presbyters, but alſo re-ordain thoſe by Presbyters, who come to them ordained already by Biſhops. [as you may ſee, * in their Diſcipline *c.* 1. *Art.* 2. —— *Les nouueaux introduits en l' Egliſe, ſpecialement les preſtres ne pourront eſtre esleus aux Miniſtere ſans diligente inquiſition, &c.* —— *& ne leur impoſera on la main, que parl' ad vis des Synodes provinciaux.* —— And * in *P. du Moulin* on this Article. ‖ —— *Quand un Preſtre de l' Egliſe Romaine eſt receu au Miniſtere entre nous, on luy impoſe les mains de-recbef, & luy conferre on une nouvelle Ordination* —— (yet the firſt re-ordainers, not being re-ordained, whence, I I pray you, had they this power; which ought to deſcend *ex traduce* from Chriſt?)]: And, again, ▵ when as the *Engliſh Presbyterians* not only have refuſed their Biſhop's aſſiſtance in this ſacred action, but expelled them from their ſeats. Surely, a neceſſity never excuſeth thoſe, that make it.

§. 163. 6.

‖ *De la vocat. l.* 2. *tract.* 3. *c.* 3.

§. 164. 7. 7. Lastly, These necessities, with which these Writers defend their practice, as the Presbyterian Churches here, or abroad, have not had; so neither have they, in any good earnest, pretended to: They ejecting Bishops, and changing Episcopal Government, upon this ground chiefly; that their *Presbyterial* Government is established, not only *jure Apostolico* but *Divino*; *Episcopal*, by neither: but introduced, in after times, not by the Spirit of God, but humane prudence; advantageous for exalting *Antichrist*; ineffectual for averting schisms, (the end for which it was entertained) lastly vitiated with many adherent corruptions, (See before *Sect.* 92.—*Sect.* 155. *n.* 2.—*Sect.* 155. *n.* 5.).—I do not repent me, that I have been somewhat long in shewing you the lost labour of some of our Episcopal Divines; who can defend the Presbyterian Churches abroad, * by no other way, than such, as they will not accept, and by which they will not defend themselves: and * by no other way, than such, as still leaveth them in a schisme and an unjustifiable separation, if we will take their own doctrine and intentions, and not the colours of these Writers instead thereof. Now, to proceed.

§. 165. R. *to* φφ². 1. To φφ². See the places answered before, where they are urged §. 65. *n.* 5. 1 Antiquity, in, sometimes, using the imposition of some Presbyter's hands together with the Bishop's in Ordinations, sometimes not, (see before *Sect.* 65. *n.* 3, 4.) sheweth, that it had no apprehension of any absolute necessity thereof; Neither doth that, one, example in Scripture (1 *Tim.* 4. 14. taken exactly in such a sense, as the Presbyterians would have it) that such a thing was once done, prove it therefore necessary always to be done, ‖ especially if we compare *Tit.* 1. 5. — and 1 *Tim.* 5. 22, 19. (As expounded by the Fathers), Where Ordination, as well as Judicature, is committed to single persons: Neither is there any probability, that *Titus* in *Creet*, when he went about to do this thing κατὰ πόλιν, had any

‖ *See Sect.* 127.

any joint commiſſioners with him, without whoſe concurrence his hands had been ineffective. *Hoc poſtremò habendum eſt* (ſaith *Calvin* ‖) *non univerſam multitudinem manus impoſuiſſe ſuis Miniſtris, ſed ſolos paſtores; quanquam incertum eſt an plures* [paſtores] *ſemper manus impoſuerint, nec ne.*—Paulus *ſe, non alios complures,* Timotheo *manus impoſuiſſe commemorat.* And ſee his comment on *presbyterium*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. recited before *Sect.* 127. (*Calvin* not liking well this crowd of hands in Ordinations, leſt ſo the Lay-Elders, being a part of his *presbyterium*, ſhould pretend to have a right to hold their hands alſo over their Miniſters Heads.). And ſuch alſo the preſent practice in the Reformed *French* Churches, that, in the Ordination of their Miniſters only one Presbyter, he who prayeth, layeth on hands according to their Order (*diſciplin des Eglis Ref. cap.* 1. *Art.* 7.)—*Celuy qui prie, mettra les mains ſur la teſte, &c.* But 2ly. the moderne Biſhops, in Ordinations of Prieſts, do always join the impoſition of hands of ſuch Presbyters as are preſent (ſee * *Eccleſiaſtical Canons* 1603. *c.* 31. and * the forme of Ordination; both that, ſince the Reformation, and that before—*Imponunt manus poſt Epiſcopum omnes ſacerdotes, qui adſunt, &c.*). And therefore the Biſhops do no way treſpaſs againſt ſuch Canons (unleſs all or a major part of the Presbyters of the whole Dioceſs be required to aſſiſt in the impoſition of hands; but the moſt rigid of the Canons urged requires only the impoſition of the hands *Presbyterorum, qui præſentes ſunt*). But then, mean while, the Presbyters offering to do ſuch things without a Biſhop, what defence have they for themſelves? As for the major part of the whole Presbytery of the Dioceſſe giving their conſent, and approbation to the perſon to be ordained; both they, and the people, as many as are preſent, are asked this conſent, before that any is ordained, in thoſe words [*if any one know any impediment,*] and in the ancienter form [*Si quis habet aliquid contra illos, &c.*] being uſhered in with this preface.—

‖ *Inſtit. l.* 4. *c.* 3 *Sect.* 16.

2 *Tim.* 1. 6.

2.

Neque

Neque non fuit frustra à Patribus institutum, ut de electione illorum, qui ad regimen altaris adhibendi sunt, consulatur etiam populus. Neither may the Bishop pass on to Ordination, till all complaints be cleared, if any be brought in (see the form of *Ordination*).

§. 166. To χχ. Power of *Ordination* followeth the Bishop's
R. to χχ. *Orders; but his *Orders, as received in his Consecration for *Bishop*; not as received in his Ordination for *Priest* (see before §. 68. *n.* 5.) At which Consecration, whether there is conferred a distinct order in some respect, though not in another, (as some say); or whether only a certain enlargement, or superior degree of the former Priestly Order, (as others): Again; whether a new character be impressed in this a distinct Sacrament, (as some); Or whether neither new character is here, nor Sacrament, as others; (which subtleties let the learned decide); On this those authors are agreed, that in this Consecration the Bishop is authorised to some *sacred acts*, * incompetible to other Priests; * not conferred on them in their Ordination; and * uncommunicable to them, for the ordinary administration of such acts. Amongst which the chiefest and most unseparable is this power of Ordination. Which if any Presbyter should presume to exercise at all by whatever dispensation or Commission (as some say); or at least, saving in some extraordinary cases, by a dispensation from the *Pope* (as others); they both pronounce such act done by a Presbyter to be not only *illicit*, as other sacerdotal acts are, when done by a Presbyter suspended, but utterly *null* and effectless. I mean, *so effectless*, as that the so ordained remain still meer Laicks (of which see before §. 65. *n.* 8.). So that from the divided opinions of the Roman Writers, (as to some particulars) in this matter, the Presbyterian cause gaineth little.

§. 167. To ϟϟ. [1] Who deny the *Real Presence* have less rea-
R. to ϟϟ. 1. son to magnify the Sacerdotal excellency in the Con-
Aquinas Suppl. q. 40. *Art.* 4. secration of the Eucharist. [2] The Bishop hath this excellency

excellency, and ſomething more. *Poteſtas eſt altior, quanto ad plura ſe extendit:* Both to be, and alſo to make Prieſts is ſomething higher, than only to be a Prieſt: an Angel is Man's ſuperior, though they agree in ſomething more noble, than any thing is, wherein they differ.

§. 168. R. to ¶¶

To ¶¶[2]. [1] Impoſition of hands, and ſaying; *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, ſurely is an Ordination; and this to ſomething new; ſince a re-ordination to the ſame ſacred Order or function is generally diſallowed; Orders may not be iterated. [2] Theſe words, which in the Ordination do follow [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*], *viz. ſtir up the grace of God, &c.* ſpoken by S. *Paul* to *Timothy*, and being different from thoſe in the ordaining of a Prieſt, do ſhew that the perſon is ordained here to *Timothy*'s grace and office, which office the Presbyterians grant to be ſuperior to Prieſt (ſee before *Sect.* 73. *n.* 1.). [3] In the form of Conſecration he is expreſly admitted to the work and miniſtry of a Biſhop; and conſequently to all the particular both duties and priviledges of a Biſhop, held either *jure Divino* or *Eccleſiaſtico*; the enumeration of which we are to ſeek not in the form of Conſecration, but in the Canons of the Church, and of Scripture, as expounded by the Church; ſo, in the Greek Church, the ordination of a Presbyter only in theſe general words *Divina gratia promovet N. devotiſſimum Diaconum in Presbyterum*; and of a Biſhop in theſe; *Divina gratia promovet N. Deo amabilem Presbyterum Epiſcopum Civitatis N. &c*, hath been always accounted ſufficient, without a recital of the ſpecial duties of their Offices. [4] Though the form of Conſecration compoſed in *Edward the ſixth's* days doth not, yet the ancienter form uſed in the *Weſtern* Church doth, number ſeveral functions of Biſhops incompetent to Presbyters; as *Judicare*; [i. e. *in foro contentioſo*] *Ordinare*; *Confirmare*. (See *Pontificale Rom.*).

1.

2.

3.

See Goar's *Euchолog. p.* 223. 302.

To

§. 169. R. *to ωω.* To *ωω.* First, Those, who so affectionately make use of this place to shew, that Presbyters may ordain a Bishop; I wish they would consider on another side, what dammage they sustain by it, in, thus, making S. *Jerom* to acknowledge; first Bishops to be in their compleat authority ‖ in *Egypt usque à S. Marco*; *i. e.* from the Apostle's early days: much contrary to this Father's *postea* and *paulatim*, as they interpret them 2ly. Those Bishops to be promoted, not by seniority, but election, contrary to their other supporter, *Hilarius*, his assertion; that, at the first, *Senior Presbyter succedebat in Primatu.* But, to come to what is urged. The Father here, to shew some ancient honour or priviledge of the *Alexandrian* Presbyters, setteth down that, by and out of this Body only, the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* continued to be elected, until the times of *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*; whereas, elsewhere, the Patriarchs are (and were so here after *Heraclas*) chosen not only by, or only out of the Presbyters of the same City; but by and out of the Bishops of the whole Province; at least, so many as could well be in a due time assembled ‖. But (mean while) how, or by whom, this Patriarch was then ordained, the Father saith nothing. The like expression muchwhat, (as Mr. *Thorndyke* hath observed) is used by *Eusebius* ‖ in the election of *Fabianus* Bishop of *Rome*: where he saith, upon the likeness of a Dove lighting upon his head, *cunctum populum dignum Episcopatu proclamasse: & incunctanter apprehensum illum in thronum Episcopalem collocasse*; yet this without implying an Ordination of Him by these persons. And the words immediately following in S. *Hierom* (which words, destroying this their comment made on the former, are not mentioned by them) do shew, that the Father could not in the former mean Ordination. The words are—*Quid enim facit, exceptâ Ordinatione, Episcopus quod Presbyter non faciat?* Which (I have shewed before) cannot be restrained only to the Bishops of his own times ‖ If Presbyters then might not ordain

‖ *V. Sect. 76. n. 2. & Sect. 87.*

V. Sect. 75 n. 3.

‖ *V. before Sect. 42. n. 3.*

‖ *Euseb. l. 6. c. 28.*

‖ *V. Sect. 132.*

ordain Presbyters, but only Biſhops might, how unreaſonable doth it ſeem to allow theſe Presbyters power to ordain Biſhops; which is cleared above‖ to be a diſtinct Ordination, alſo, from that of Presbyters? We may preſume then the Ordination of this Patriarch by Biſhops. Which may be gathered alſo from this, that *Heraclas* was contemporary to S. *Cyprian*, and lived A. D. 246. (*i. e.* an 100 years and more after the times, when the Presbyterians allow the entrance of the modern cuſtoms of Epiſcopacy) in which times, that Biſhops were ordained by Biſhops I have ſhewed before §. 42. *n* 3. in other Churches; who then can imagine, that this ſecond Patriarch in the Church, who could not have had this rank without ſome other Biſhops being ſubordinate to him, ſhould ſtep into the Chair, either without any Ordination at all, or one from them that were no Biſhops (ſee before §. 57. who it is that ſaith —*Inferior non Ordinat majorem.*)? And who can imagine that *Demetrius*, a predeceſſor to *Heraclas*, and *Dionyſius* in this Biſhoprick, who dealt ſo rigidly with *Origen*, and thoſe *Eaſtern* Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* and *Cæſarea*, ‖ who ſuffered him to preach before them, when a Laick; and ordained him a Presbyter, when mutilated, contrary (as he apprehended) to the Canons, would not have ſuffered herein ſome re-aſperſion from them, had He been ſo irregular in his own Ordination?

‖ *V. Sect.* 42. *n.* 3.

‖ *Euſeb. l.* 5. *c.* 7.— *Baron. A. D.* 230.

But it is asked ſtill: [1] Where thoſe Biſhops in *Egypt* were, who did ordain the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, while *Egypt* remained but one Province under the Government of the *Præfectus Auguſtalis*? [2] Again, *Eutychius* Patriarch of *Alexandria* (publiſhed lately in Arabick by Mr. *Selden*) is urged; who, writing *Origines Eccleſiæ Alexand.* expreſly affirms, —Marcum *Evangeliſtam ibi duodecim Presbyteros conſtituiſſe; qui nempe manerent cum Patriarchâ; adeo ut cum vacaret Patriarchatus, eligerent unum ex duodecim Presbyteris; cujus capiti reliqui manus imponerent, eumque benedicerent, & Patriarcham eum crearent.*

1. *Mr. Stillingfl. Iren. p.* 274.

2.

rent.——Who afterward also affirms; that there was no other Bishop in *Egypt* save the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, till the times of *Demetrius*, who first made three Bishops.

Blond. Apol. præf. 17,18. [This evidence out of *Eutychius* was urged by ' Mr. *Blondel*, but not so much valued; For, though it fitted him well for Presbyter's ordaining their Bishops, ' yet, on another side, it pinched him, in crossing his ' scheme of those primitive times, in these two things. ' 1 The one; that S. *Mark* should constitute *Anianus*, Patriarch; which being pretended in the Apostle's days, no ' such superior authority can be as then allowed by ' *Blondel*, nor was the name of Patriarch (saith he) ' used in the Church, till after *A. D.* 400. 2 The other: That these *Alexandrian* Presbyters should (then) ' elect their Patriarch; which thwarts *Hilarius* his much ' valued testimony; that, in those first times, the Presidents succeeded by Seniority, not election; so that ' this testimony hurts more the Presbyterian, than the ' Episcopal cause.] '

R. to 1. Yet to return a just reply to what is observed. First to the Question asked above, I answer; If no Bishop in *Egypt*, what necessity, that no other Bishop might ordain the Bishop of *Alexandria*? Again, the other Patriarchal Sees of the *Asian* and *Western* Churches, as Christianity multiplied, erecting from the very beginning new Bishopricks in smaller Cities about them,

V. Pontif. Damas. (touching which you may see a Catalogue kept of those erected in the *Roman* Patriarchy in every Bishop's days) and this Mother-Church of *Alexandria* being inferior to none in a populous and flourishing Religion (see *Philo Judæus*, contemporary with S. *Mark* there,

‖ *Apud Euseb. l. 2. c.* 17. his early *encomium* of it ‖); how is it possible, that it should remain sterile, and without any off-spring of other Bishops till *Demetrius*, or *Heraclas* his times, (*i. e.*) till the middle of the second Century? But then to clear this matter further, S. *Mark's* life in *Photius* saith; that he planted Churches in *Pentapolis*, as well as *Alexandria*; and the Author here quoted (*Eutychius*); that he planted

planted Churches in *Barca*, ſome part of *Egypt*, as Mr. *Selden* notes: and then, the *Nicene* Council declares; that the *Alexandrian* Biſhop had the preſidency alſo of theſe Churches *more antiquo*, ordering that it ſhould ſtill ſo continue. *Athanaſius* ſets down the names of ninety five *Ægyptian* Biſhops, that ſate in the Council of *Sardica* in his time: all which, ſurely, were not the growth of the laſt Century alone. *Ægypt* having then a greater number of Biſhops, for its extent, than any other Region, (unleſs perhaps ſome other parts of *Africk*), where multiplication of Biſhops is ſaid to have been the moſt early. Aſcend we higher to the times of *Dionyſius*. We find ‖ divers Letters and Orders ſent by him to ſeveral *Ægyptian* Biſhops, and in particular to *Baſilides*; who is ſtiled in *Euſebius*, *Pentapolitanarum paræciarum Epiſcopus*, having ſeveral Dioceſes alſo under him; ſo that, then there were not only Biſhops, but Metropolitans, ſubject to the *Alexandrian* Patriarch. Yet higher, and before *Heraclas*, we find *Demetrius* ſaid by *Euſebius* ‖, *Paræciarum* Alexandriæ *ac reliquæ* Ægypti *Epiſcopatum poſt* Julianum *ſuſcepiſſe* [*paræciæ* ſignifying Dioceſes or Biſhopricks. *V.* before §. 61.]: and we find alſo *Origen*, contemporary to *Demetrius*, and *Catechiſt* in the Divinity-School of *Alexandria* before *Heraclas*, deſcribing the Election of Biſhops in his days by Biſhops, as well as Presbyters, ——*Epiſcopi & Presbyteri* (ſaith he) *quibus creditæ ſunt Cathedræ, qui tradunt eccleſias, &c.* ‖ If Biſhops concurr in the Election, much more will they, in the Ordination. And before this again the Emperour *Adrian*'s Epiſtle, related by *Vopiſcus* in the life of *Saturninus*, mentions Biſhops in *Ægypt*, which Mr. *Selden* in his notes on *Eutychius* hath obſerved as not well according with what that Author delivers. Before *Adrian* alſo *Philo Judæus* (*Euſeb.* l. 2. c. 17.) mentions τὰς τῶν Ἐπισκοπῶν προεδρίας there, in the plural. Laſtly, ſee S. *Cyprian*'s words quoted before §. 61.——Jampridem *per omnes Provincias*, &c. As for the Civil Government of *Ægypt*; Firſt, what ever it

‖ *V. Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 6. c. 45.*—*l. 7. c. 25.*—*l. 6. c. 41.*—

‖ *Euſeb. l. 6.*

‖ *V. before, Sect. 32.*

was then, it no way regulates the Ecclesiastical, especially in the times before the Emperours were Christians; Mr. *Selden* in his notes on the aforesaid Author p. 83. hath observed —— *Ante* Constantini *exitum seu tempora proximantia præfecturæ sacræ non instar Civilium, aut ad earum sive amplitudinem, sive angustias, ut sæculis recentioribus, constituebantur, &c.* —— *Sæculis illis vetustioribus contractiores procul dubio fuere multò, adeoque multò numerosiores Paroeciæ, Dioceses, seu Ecclesiæ, quas curabant Episcopi, limites sortiti, quos nunc plane nescimus.* 2[lv]. Let *Egypt* be one Province, this may have, many Bishops, as many Cities.

R. *to.* 2. To the second I Answer, That *Eutychius* was a late Writer of the tenth age, and that in several things he contradicts the ancienter. As * in saying: ▵ that there were only twelve Presbyters in *Alexandria*; contrary to *Athanasius*, ‖ who recites more; ▵ that these elected out of themselves the Patriarch, till *Alexander*; contrary to S. *Jerom*, who saith, till *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*. And the Election of *Athanasius*, described (*Apol.* 2.) by the Synod of *Alexandria*, sufficiently confutes this Relation: which Election, had it been different from his predecessor's, would have been questioned for this by his enemies, as it was questioned by them on another account, but falsely; they alledging, that he had the suffrages only of seven Bishops. And so doth the election of one *Theonas* there, in opposition to *Athanasius*, by the Bishops of *Meletius* his faction, sufficiently confute it ‖. Again, * in saying; that in the Council of *Nice* there were convened 2048 Bishops, of which 318. Orthodox, were opposed by the rest, but in vain; the Emperour siding with these; and in telling many other incredibles concerning it (see Mr. *Selden's* notes 19. 71. 77.) contrary to the relations of ancient Historians, and of *Athanasius*, one waiting upon his Bishop in this Council. Lastly, amongst several others, * in saying, that, till *Demetrius*, there was no Bishop in *Ægypt*, save the Patriarch only; contrary to *Eusebius*, and other testimonies but now quoted. To

‖ *Apolog.* 2. *Ep. Theogin. &c.*

‖ *V. Epiphan. Hær.* 68.

To aa. See what is said before §. 127. By the first *Apost. Canon*, only two Bishops; by the *Apost. Constitutions*, only one Bishop, is sufficient, for the validity of the Ordination in case of necessity, if the Election be Canonical. So *Evagrius*, in time of the *Arian* persecution, is said by *Socrates l.* 4. *c.* 13. and by *Sozomen l.* 6. *c.* 13. to have been ordained Bishop of *Constantinople* singly by *Eustathius* an exiled Bishop of *Antioch*. And in the ancient form of Consecration, one Bishop only is called the *Consecrator*, the other two Bishops Assistants. In *Pelagius* his ordination the Presbyter was used only as an assistant; not necessary to the Ordination, but (in a third Bishop's absence) representing the usual solemnities of the action. §. 170. *Ap. Const. l.* 8. *c.* 33. R. *to* aa. *V. Pontif. Rom.*

To bb. ▵ Some of the *Chorepiscopi*, at least of ancienter times, received Episcopal Ordination, and were Bishops: see above §. 65. *n.* 7. —— and *Conc. Antioch. can* 10. —— and *Conc. Laodic. c.* 57. Bishops may be validly ordained by fewer than three, may be many ways subordinate, one to another; may, by their superiors be restrained from, or limited in their exercise of Ordination (as, not to do it without a licence, &c.) as the Church, in her Councils, from time to time thinks fit. ▵ Other *Chorepiscopi*, in some times, there were, who were only Presbyters, and had no power at all to ordain: and these, lest they should, or also, because they did, mistake their office from their title, and from some other preheminency which they were entrusted with, were often prohibited Ordinations. §. 171. R. *to* bb.

To cc. First; never any such Ordination being read of in Antiquity to have been attempted to be done by any City-presbyter, as it was sometimes done by the *Chorepiscopi*: and 2^ly. this Canon, which was made after *A. D.* 300, when Episcopacy was at its full growth, being in the ancient *Latin* Copies rendred and explicated thus; —*Sed nec* [*licere*] *Presbyteris Civitatis, sine Episcopi præcepto, amplius aliquid imperare, vel sine authoritate literarum ejus, in unaquâque parochiâ, aliquid agere:* §. 172. R. to cc. 1. 2. *V. Mr. Thornd. Right of Church. c.* 3. *p.* 141.

3. *agere:* And 3ly. the *Greek* of the 57th. Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* (held not long after this, see *Baron. A. D.* 414. in a near adjoining province of *Asia minor*) delivering the same matter so, as the *Latin* Copies do here; — *Quod non oportet in vicis & pagis Episcopos constitui.* — τὰς ἢ ἐν ταῖς χώραις ἐπισκόπους, μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ γνωμῆς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἀσαύτως ἢ καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ γνωμῆς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. *Eos autem qui prius constituti fuerunt, nihil agere sine mente Episcopi civitatis. Similiter autem & Presbyteros nihil agere sine mente Episcopi* [*Nihil agere, i. e.* of those functions, whereof their Order
4. rendred them capable]: And 4ly. Concil. *Arelatense*, held about the same time, *can.* 19. —— —— and, before all these, *Can. Apostol.* 40. expressing the subjection of Presbyters just in the same phrase with the aforesaid Copies: I say, these things being considered, it will not seem reasonable to collect from this Canon (where the mention of *Presbyteri Civitatis* comes but in a Parenthesis), that, for the times before this Canon was made, (that is, till *A. D.* 314.) the Presbyters, and that in the City, where the Bishop resided, might ordain Presbyters; and that without his licence, [2] But, if this satisfy not, you may see above, §.65.*n.* 1. &c, how much the histories of those times contradict any such Presbyter-Ordination. [3] If that appears not; yet this thing being obtained, that with the Bishop's Licence Presbyters may ordain, supporteth not the Presbyterian cause; who have always so ordained, without their Bishop's licence, against their Bishop's injunctions.

§.173.*n.* 1. R. to dd. To dd [1] The instance is only concerning the making of a Deacon, not of a Presbyter. [2] It followeth not, that, because this was faultily done, S. *Cyprian* not permitting, nor so much as knowing of it, therefore if he had permitted it, it had been done rightly. For a thing may be faulty in more than one respect. [3] As *Novatus* (once a Presbyter of *Cyprian*'s, but, whether

ther then ſo, ſomewhat uncertain) is ſaid to have made *Feliciſſimus* a Deacon, at *Carthage*; ſo is he, to have made *Novatianus* a Biſhop at *Rome*. The Father's words are — *Quoniam pro magnitudine ſuâ debeat* Carthaginem Roma *præcedere, illic graviora commiſit. Quia hic adverſus Eccleſiam Diaconum fecerat, illic Epiſcopum* [Novatianum] *fecit*. Now, I hope, it will not be maintained; that Presbyters ordained Biſhops in S. *Cyprian's* days (ſee above §. 42. *n.* 3.). But, if they did; this is certain, that *Novatus* was none of the ordainers of *Novatianus*, which were three obſcure *Italian* Biſhops, as you may ſee in *Cornelius* his Letter, *apud Euſeb. l. 6. c. 42. Novatus* therefore may be underſtood to make *Feliciſſimus* Deacon; as *Novatianus*, Biſhop; *i. e.* to procure it from ſome Biſhop of his own faction at *Carthage*. For not only *Cyprian*, in his receſſe in thoſe times of perſecution, employed other Biſhops at *Carthage pro ſe vicarios*, (*Epiſt.* 38.) as *Caldonius*, *Herculanus*, and others: but there was at this time an anti-faction of ſome Biſhops there, who oppoſed S. *Cyprian*'s Government, and ordained one *Fortunatus* his Presbyter for their Head or Primate in his ſtead (ſee Ep. 55. to *Cornelius*). Concerning the Biſhop's ordaining the inferior degrees of Clergy as well as Presbyters, in thoſe days, ſee above, §. 65. *n.* 3. Yet this Father alſo complains, that in his days ſome aſſumed Clergy-titles to themſelves without any Ordination at all. See *De unitate Eccleſiæ, — Hi ſunt qui ſe ultro, &c.* 4 Laſtly, all granted that is here demanded, the Presbyterian cauſe is not hence ſupported; for the ſhewing, that a Presbyter may ordain *Epiſcopo permittente*, will not warrant their Ordinations, which have always been *Epiſcopo prohibente*.

Epiſt. 49.

To ee. [1]. I have this to repreſent to you. [1] That this is ſtoried to have been done in the fifth Century; done, in a Country always abundant in Biſhops, ninety five *Egyptian* Biſhops are named by *Athanaſius*, ‖ to have been preſent in the Council of *Sardica*, held long before *Caſſian's* time; done by a Holy man, * after ſo many

§. 173. *n.* 2. R. to ee.

‖ *Apol.* 2. *p.* before, §. 3. §. 5. *n.* 8.

Canons

Canons (cited above) declaring Presbyterian Ordination unlawful; and particularly, * after the censure of *Ischiras* (ordained by a Presbyter) in the Council of *Alexandria*. [2] That the words urged are very capable of another sence, well according with the Canons, and practice of the Church; namely, the Abbot *Paphnutius* his preferring *Daniel*, though Junior to several others, to be made Presbyter by the Bishop. For the words are *A* Paphnutio *ad Diaconii prælatus est officium*—and—*Presbyterii honore provexit.* Now, in these religious Societies those only were promoted to the Sacerdotal office, whom the Abbot nominated, and thought fit: as appears in the rule of S. *Benedict* composed presently after these times, *c.* 62.—*Abbas de suis eligat, qui dignus sit fungi sacerdotio.* See *Gazet* the Commentator on *Cassian* in this place.

§. 174. *n.* 1. R. *to* ee[2]. To ee[2]. [1] From the strict Letter of the words, *Blondel* may urge, that the people themselves, and not their Presbyters, ordained Bishops [2] All Orthodox Bishops, to a man, were not sent into banishment, but the more eminent, and who more openly declared themselves. *Socrates* saith only *per omnes* ferè *Civitates, &c.* [3] All, sent, probably went not, but some lay hid. [4] Those to be ordained might repair to such Bishops in exile for Ordination: Some of which exiled Bishops might be either in, or near, their coasts. How many shifts may be made, now near *A. D.* 400. to avoid a Presbyterial Ordination of Bishops, had not Mr. *Blondel* too strongly fancied it? [5] But, who can endure, that *Epiphanius* his words should be thus interpreted (*Hær.* 73.) as to make Presbyters ordain Bishops, who within a few pages (*Hæres.* 75.), accusing *Aërius* for no less than mad, that he should introduce such an opinion into the World, as the equality of Presbyters with Bishops, brings in this for his first argument against him, that Presbyters cannot ordain—*Episcoporum enim Ordo Patrum generator est, patres enim generat Ecclesiæ, Presbyterorum vero non potens generare*

Hist. l. 4. *c.* 14.

nerare Patres, per lavacri regenerationem generat filios Eccleſia, &c. ——

Indeed Mr. *Blondel* (if I well underſtand him), in moſt of his inſtances, grounds his arguments upon ſome ſlight conjectures, when the place may well be conſtrued in a ſence agreeable to the common practice. △ Such is that his inſtance in *Evagrius* (about *A. D.* 370.) his being ordained Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* by *Euſtathius* a Presbyter of the ſame Church: becauſe that *Socrates* ‖ ſaith, that this *Evagrius* was ordained by *Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Antioch*; and Mr. *Blondel* can ſhew, that this Biſhop *Euſtathius* was deceaſed before *Evagrius* his conſecration. But hence it follows not, that *Evagrius* muſt be conſecrated by another *Euſtathius*; or that ſuch *Euſtathius* muſt be *Euſtathius* the *Conſtantinopolitan* Presbyter; or that the Orthodox in *Conſtantinople*, when all the Church-Canons were in vigour, could not procure ſome Biſhop, or other, to ordain this, at that time, the ſecond Patriarch of the Church Catholick. △ Such, that his inſtance in the *Novatian* Biſhops, as he conjectures, ordained by Presbyters; for which he (p. 357.) urgeth thus —— *Cùm nulla ſe iſti factioni eccleſia addixerit. Nullus ei cum adjuncto Clero Epiſcopus nomen* (*quod ſcimus*) *dederit Sola ubique Cleri plebisque ſegmenta ab unitate deſciſcentia in partes* [Novatiani] *tranſiſſe neceſſe eſt, quæ* [ſegmenta] *poſtea ſibimet Epiſcopos conſtituerint.* Thus he, *as if Novatianus* their founder, who procured with great diligence three Biſhops, out of a corner of *Italy*, to ordain himſelf (ſee *Euſeb. l. 6. c. 42.*) could not ordain his ſucceſſors; and thoſe, others; or, as if ſome Presbyter, elected for their Biſhop in one place, could not repair for his Epiſcopal Ordination to ſome Biſhop of theirs reſiding in another. △ Such thoſe conjectures, made by him and others, of Presbyter's ordaining, * from there being, ſometimes, only one Biſhop in a whole Nation (It is ſo now in *Portugal*, yet without Presbyterian-Ordinations): * From a Nation, for many years profeſſing Chriſtianity under the government of ſome

§. 174. n. 2.

‖ *Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 4. c. 13.*

Mr. *Stillingf.* p. 374, *&c.*

Priests, before having any Bishop at all residing therein: * From some Dioceses being of a vast extent, in comparison of others: * From Bishop's Chairs sometimes after their Death, long vacant, in times of external persecution, or intestine divisions. R. But none of these do necessarily inferr Presbyterian Ordinations; but either; that, for such time, no new Presbyters being made, so much the fewer discharged all the Ecclesiastical Offices; Or, that those newly made went further from home for their Ordination; Or, that some other Presbyters from foreign parts were, successively, sent thither for a supply. As, now for a long time, the *East-Indies* and *China* are supplyed, in so great a distance, with Priests, from *Europe*, and all *Portugal* repairs to one Suffragan Bishop for Ordination: Several Episcopal functions also being by delegation dischargeable by the Presbytery; so that Christian Religion may possibly subsist, either without the residence of a Bishop, or the Ordaining by Presbyters. Such conjectures therefore as these are too weak arms, with which to overthrow such a plenary Tradition in Antiquity, as this; that single Presbyters did not, nor might not ordain Bishops.

§. 175. *n.* 1. R. to ff.' To ff.' These *Pseudo episcopi*, are not single Presbyters, but true Bishops, for the Episcopal Character, though not the true Bishops of the place, they pretended to; true Bishops, as to their Ordination, though uncanonical, or false ones, as to their deficient election, and their unjust intrusion into some Bishopricks rightly due to another. For so S. *Leo* describes them, —— *Nec à Clericis electi, nec à plebibus expetiti, nec à provincialibus Episcopis cum Metropolitani judicio consecrati. A provincialibus, &c. i. e.* by the consent of the Major part at least of these given to their consecration, though it was an easie matter to get two or three to ordain them. See S. *Cyprian* (Ep. 52. *Antoniano*) calling *Novatianus* and his Successors *pseudo-episcopi*, though *Novatian* himself was sufficiently Ordained by three Bishops, as was shewed but now; and

and himself Ordained Successors. ——*Cùm jampridem*, (saith he) *per omnes provincias ordinati sunt Episcopi in ætate antiqui, in fide integri*, &c. *Ille* [Novatianus] *super eos creare alios* pseudo-episcopos *audet.*——And Epist. 55. to *Cornelius* he saith of *Fortunatus* ordained by some heretical Bishops at *Carthage* in his place; —— *Hi quinque* Fortunatum *sibi* pseudo-episcopum *cooptarunt*, &c. If these *pseudo-episcopi* then were, as to their Order, true Bishops, no wonder, that S. *Leo* ratified their Ordinations of Presbyters, for the time they sate in their invaded Bishopricks.

To ff2. This is sufficiently answered by Dr. *Hammond*‖, shewing both, * uncertainty in those old Relations which they build upon; and * a non-consequence in the arguing; since Presbyters (there) might be supplied from the same Fountain, from which they first sprang, as now in *Virginia* they are supplied from *England:* I may add; or, as in *England* the *Roman* Clergy is supplied from foreign parts. §. 175. *n.* 2. R. to ff.2

‖ Vindicat. of Differt p. 160. &c.

To ff3. Several priviledges this Monastery, from whence they were ordinarily chosen, might have above and over the *Scotch* Bishops; and yet not that, of these simple Presbyters, ordaining of those, Bishops; especially in the seventh age, against not only the Universal practice contrary, but so many Canons opposing it. The *Conventus seniorum*, urged, appears by the Context to be *Concilium totius Provinciæ*, out of which K. *Oswald* sent for a Bishop: and in this Council were Bishops. For *Bede* saith, that there were Bishops in the Province, in that he saith they were subject to the Monks; and then surely Bishops will make a part at least of this provincial Synod, (called *Conventus seniorum*, to include also these so dignified Presbyters sitting with the Bishops): and then, who can believe that these Bishops had no hand in ordaining of Bishops? So, *Ordinatus à Scotis*, is meant, by the *Scotch* Bishops, as Venerable *Bede* explains himself. For *Cedda*, [St. *Chad*,] said to be ordained *à Scotis* in §. 175. *n.* 2. R. to ff.3

Bede l. 3. c. 25. is related to have been Ordained *à Finano, vocatis ad se in ministerium Ordinationis aliis duobus Episcopis* [very canonically, you see] *Ibid.* in cap 22. In like manner (see Bed. l. 3. c. 28.) Abbot *Cedda* Brother to S. *Chad* the Bishop; was afterward consecrated Bishop by *Winni, assumptis in societatem Ordinationis duobus de Britonum gente Episcopis.* Lastly, these are *Blondel's* own words, if they may have any weight, p. 373.—*Anglicani & Gallicani Abbates, utut Episcopis ex monasterio suo assumptis superiores fuerint. Ordinationis potestate caruerunt.*

§. 176. n. 1. R. to gg. To gg. *Quæcunque regulis novellis prohibita esse noscuntur, ante libera fuerunt*; This proposition is false, unless *tantùm* be put in. *Quæcunque tantùm*, &c. In *Concil. Arelat.* 1. *can.* 15. 'tis said:—*De Diaconis, quos cognovimus multis locis offerre*; [*i. e.* consecrate the Eucharist] *placuit minimè fieri debere.* It follows not therefore, that, before this Canon, Deacons might lawfully consecrate the Eucharist.—In *Canon. Apost.* 6. 'tis said.—*Episcopus aut Presbyter uxorem propriam nequaquam sub obtentu religionis abjicat.*—And in *Can.* 14. *Episcopo non licere alienam parochiam, propriâ relictâ, pervadere.* It followeth not therefore, that these things formerly were lawfull. All new laws restrain not things formerly indifferent, but many reinforce things formerly enjoined by Man or God: *ut quæ male pullulasse noscuntur, radicitùs evellantur. Damasus,* Ep. 4.

§. 176. n. 2. As for the Canon of 2. *Conc. Hispal.* It is here imperfectly urged by following an erroneous Copy of *Garz. Loaisa.* For you must know, that this Canon is only a transcription of S. *Leo's* decree sent to the Bishops of *Germany* and *France*; part of which is recited before §. 64. By which Original of *Leo's*, you may discover these words [*Quædam authoritate veteris Legis*] to be faultily omitted in *Loaisa's* copy, (though I wonder upon what grounds, Mr. *Blondel* had rather have *Leo* to be falsified). And also, in some editions of *Leo*, we read, instead of, *quædam novellis, & Ecclesiasticis, &c.*

quædam

quædam novæ, etiam eccleſiaſticis, &c. The Canon, being made againſt Presbyters preſuming to erect or conſecrate new Altars or Churches, in the true Copy, runs thus——*In Divinis Libris, præcipiente Domino, ſolus* Moſes *in Tabernaculo Dei erexit altare, ſolus ipſe unxit, quia ſummus utique ſacerdos Dei erat. Itaque id quod tantùm facere principibus Sacerdotum* [*i.e* Epiſcopis] *juſſum eſt, quorum typum* Moſes *and* Aaron *tenebant, Presbyteri, qui filiorum* Aaron *geſtant figuram, accipere non præſumant: Nam quamvis, &c.* as before; *quædam tamen authoritate veteris legis* [*i.e.* as type of the new], *quædam novellis, & eccleſiaſticis* [or as I noted *quædam novæ, etiam eccleſiaſticis*] *regulis ſibi prohibita noverint, ſicut, Presbyterorum, ac Diaconorum, & Virginum conſecratio, ſicut conſtitutio altaris, benedictio, vel unctio: ſiquidem nec licere eis Eccleſiam conſecrare, nec per impoſitionem manus paracletum Spiritum tradere, nec chriſma conficere, &c.* Where you may obſerve: Firſt, that *Novellis regulis* without the precedence of *veteris legis* ſeems very improper to be uſed by this Council; as *neither ſuting well with their preſſing obedience to theſe rules, *nor with the rules themſelves, which for ſeveral of the things prohibited, being found in the ſecond or third age of the Church, are truly not *Novellæ*, but *antiquæ* rather, in reſpect of a Council held in the ſeventh age: *nor with the precedent compariſon of the authority of Biſhops with that of *Aaron*, which the Presbyters therefore, as reſembling only *Aaron's* Sons, (it is ſaid,) might not uſurp. 2ly. You may obſerve, that *Novellis & Eccleſiaſticis regulis* was neceſſary here to be put in, becauſe ſome things here named are prohibited to Presbyters, neither by Divine, nor Apoſtolical, but only by latter Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions.

To hh. Firſt, it is not granted, what is here ſuppoſed; that Ordination by Biſhops, or Epiſcopacy ſuperior to Presbytery is only an Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution. 2ly. In Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions; this propoſition: §. 177. R. to hh.

position: *Omnis Ecclesia* [particularis] *potest uti propriâ & indefectibili potestate ad abrogandum pro arbitrio jus humanum, in quod ante consenserat*; is false. For Ecclesiastical Constitutions of the whole Church oblige each part. Else, General Councils have hitherto strangely, in this, mistaken their power; who oblige all to their Canons, and most of those Canons are only Ecclesiastical Constitutions. Which Canons if any particular Church (nay some Presbyters only of such Church as *Blondel* meaneth it), after her former acceptation of them together with the rest of the Church Catholick, may abrogate again, when ever she thinks fit; since the Church Universal consisteth only of many particulars; these Canons oblige none, save during their own pleasure (and the same must be maintained of the Ecclesiastical, (*i. e.* humane) Constitutions of National, Provincial, Diocesan, Synods). And, thus; the Council's *anathema*'s and censures, for the breach of her Canons, are valid only toward such, who as yet think fit to obey such Canons; invalid, to so many as reject such Canons; *i. e.* in plain *English*; their censures are of force towards all, except those, that incurr them. But *Blondel*'s denying of Presbyters obligation, here, proceedeth from his denying of their subordination; which subordination of Presbyters hath been formerly sufficiently proved.

§. 178. R. to kk. To kk. *Regula de sacris Ordinibus per Episcopum tantùm conferendis*, is not *in complures gravis*. Whether it be so, we are not to take the judgment of a part against the whole; of Subjects against their Governors.

§. 179. R. to ll. To ll. The Monuments of Antiquity teach the contrary.

§ 180. R to mm. To mm. *Lex, Jus, contrario usu aut desuetudine aliquorum; non abroganda.*

§. 181. R. to nn. To nn. *1 They are tied to the Laws of Councils, who are not present, who have no Vote, in them. As the Common people; Deacons; and why not Presbyters? who are, *quoad regimen Ecclesiæ, aut jure divino aut Apostolico,*

Apoſtolico, [or, if only *jure Eccleſiaſtico*, it were ſufficient for this] *Epiſcopis impares.* 2 I add further: * They are tied to the Laws of Councils who do not conſent to them, if they be a part of the Church univerſal inconſiderable in number to the aſſenters. Otherwiſe, the *Arian*, *Neſtorian*, or *Eutychian* Biſhops, or Churches, or Clergy, have no obligation to the Councils of *Nice*, *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon.* 3 Laſtly, to theſe decrees of Councils concerning Biſhops all the Presbyters in the Church of God, excepting an inconſiderable number, have conſented, do conſent.

To oo. That Council uſeth this term *Ordinarius* not in reſpect of the Biſhop's conferring, * of the order, of *Sacerdotium*, or Presbytery, but * of the Minor Orders; the conferring of which (theſe being of leſs conſequence), is not ſuppoſed to be ſo, by divine inſtitution, affixed to Biſhops, but that the Church may diſpenſe with ſome others to give them; as it hath conceded it heretofore to Presbyter-Cardinals in their own Churches, and to Presbyter-Abbots in their own Monaſteries. §. 182. R. to oo.

To pp. Firſt, here it is granted; that no perſon, nor no neceſſity, or motive whatever, can diſpence with, or alter, any thing in that which is inſtituted, either *jure Divino* or *Apoſtolico* (*i. e.* either by God or by his Apoſtles, who are acted by God's Spirit), as perpetually to be obſerved. All ſides agree to this. 2ly. It is granted; that there are ſome of the Church of *Rome*, who hold, that the *Pope* may, by his commiſſion, ſufficiently authoriſe any ſingle Presbyter to ordain Presbyters: and conſequently, who hold the power of Ordination not to belong to Biſhops, either *jure Divino*, or *Apoſtolico*, in the manner before named; *i. e.* ſo, that in no caſe whatever, the exerciſe thereof may be transferred to another beſides thoſe, whom Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, have left the Ordinary Miniſters thereof. §. 183. *n.* 1. R. to pp. 1. 2.

But

§ 183. n. 2. 1. But now you must note, on the other side, these things. First; that these *Roman* Writers hold the Apostles themselves so to have reserved this Office to Bishops, and inhibited for ever the exercise thereof to single Presbyters, That, unless the *Pope* himself (whose power these Authors, being mostwhat Canonists, not Divines, seek to inlarge to the uttermost) license them to do it, such Presbyterial Ordination is not only uncanonical or unlawful, but also null, invalid, and effecting nothing. So *Panormitan*, one of those they quote (in *lib.* 1. *Decret. de consuetudine* c. 4.)——*Ritus Apostolorum circa sacramenta habent impedire characteris impressionem.* —— *Ad schismata sedanda, ordinaverunt Apostoli, ut crearentur Episcopi, & certa sacramenta iis reservarunt, illa interdicendo simplicibus Presbyteris.*—— *& Talis Ordinatio* [i. e. Apostolorum, quâ reservabant certa sacramenta Episcopis, & interdicebant Presbyteris] *habet impedire etiam impressionem characteris; quia, si Presbyteri illa* [sacramenta] *de facto conferunt, nihil conferunt.* Thus he, to save and comply with this *phænomenon* [the nullity of Presbyterian Ordination], found in antiquity, and in the general received Doctrine of the Church. And so *Rosell* part 4. c. 18.——*Propter schismata* restrictus *fuit* à Petro & Apostolis character, *& Ordo iste sacerdotalis*, &c.—*Quam restrictionem non video quare Papa successor Petri, & eâdem authoritate fungens, non possit, causâ subsistente, relaxare.* Little defence then there is of the Presbyterian practice, from these Writers, who pronounce their Ordinations null by virtue of the *Apostle*'s order.

§. 183. n. 3. 2. 2ly. Concerning the *Pope*'s power in this matter, they grant, the *Apostles* to have so restrained this Office to Episcopacy, that neither the *Pope*, nor the Church can take away Episcopacy; or make an exact parity amongst all Presbyters; or hinder, that the Bishops should not always remain in the Church the ordinary Ministers of Ordination, Confirmation, &c; Whatever, in extraordinary cases, is left by the Apostles to the Churche's

Church's permittance. [Thus *Lainez*, that great Aſſertor of the *Pope's* ſupereminent Power *jure divino* in the Council of *Trent*, yet acknowledged Biſhops, (i. e. *as they are ſuperior to Presbyters*), *to be of divine Ordination alſo*; *and that the* Pope *could not take away the general Order of making Biſhops in the Church.* (See *Soave* l. 7. p. 613.). —— And the Council of *Trent* (*Seſſ.* 23. *Can.* 6.) to the ſame purpoſe affirmeth, the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, as conſiſting ſubordinately of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Miniſters, to be inſtituted *Ordinatione Divinâ. Si quis dixerit, in Eccleſiâ Catholicâ non eſſe Hierarchiam divinâ Ordinatione inſtitutam, quæ conſtat ex Epiſcopis, Presbyteris, & Miniſtris, Anathema ſit.* Ordinatione divinâ; or *jure divino*, if you will, concerning the Office of Biſhops ſuperior to Presbyters, as to the acts of Order; for, touching this, there was no Controverſie amongſt the *Tridentine* Fathers; See *Soave's* Hiſtory l. 7. p. 623. 734. But only, touching ſome acts of Epiſcopal Juriſdiction.——And, ſince the Council of *Trent*, thus *Bellarmin de Rom. Pontif.* l. 4. c. 22.—*Omnes in eo conveniunt, juriſdictionem Epiſcoporum, ſaltem in genere, eſſe de jure divino.*——And, *niſi ita eſſet, poſſet Pontifex mutare hunc ordinem, & inſtituere, ne ullus ſit in Eccleſiâ Epiſcopus, quod ſine dubio non poteſt facere.*—— And cap. 25. —*Ordo Epiſcoporum ab ipſo Chriſto inſtitutus eſt, & proinde jure divino in Eccleſiam introductus.* ——The Council of *Florence* ‖ likewiſe declares, the Biſhop to be the ordinary Miniſter of conferring Orders. ——And ſo the Council of *Trent* † decrees, the Biſhop to be the ſole ordinary Miniſter of Confirmation. And elſewhere ‖ it ſaith; ——*Confirmandi, & miniſtros Eccleſiæ ordinandi, poteſtatem reliqui inferioris ordinis* [i. e. Presbyteri] *nullam habent. Nullam*, that is, *nullam ordinariam*, at leaſt; All others, ſave Biſhops, reſtrained either *jure Divino*, or *Apoſtolico*, perpetually from this.]

‖ *In decret. Armen.*
† *Seſſ.* 7. c. 3. *de Confirmat.*
‖ *Seſſ.* 23. c. 4.

3ly. You may note; that, though ſome Canoniſts have gone thus far, as to ſay; that the *Pope* may li- §. 183. *n.* 4.

cense a single Presbyter to give orders; yet this is but a pure Speculation of theirs, without the Production, in any Age, of any one example thereof. It being a thing never yet acted by any *Pope*, nor defended by the *Pope* that it may be acted, some *Pope* having also declared against it, as *Adrian* the Sixth.

§. 183. *n.* 5. 4. 4ly. That, as some *Roman* Writers have had this opinion (Canonists especially), so the most of these Writers, and those of far greater note, the Divines, maintain the contrary. Namely, that the Power of Ordination doth so belong to Bishops *jure Divino*; that no Person can, by any Dispensation, commit the Ordination of a Presbyter to any other. [See *Aquin.* Supplement q. 38. art. 1.——*Ex Papæ commissione, qui habet plenitudinem potestatis Pontificalis, aliquis Sacerdos simplex potest conferre ordines minores, & confirmare: non autem aliquis non Sacerdos, nec iterùm Sacerdos,* majores ordines, *&c. Bellarmine*, no enemy to the Pope's Priviledges, *de Sacram.* l. 2. c. 28. ——*Ordo excellit omnibus* [Sacramentis], *exceptâ Confirmatione, ratione Ministri. Nam solum ab Episcopo conferri potest. Imò etiam videtur excellere, in hâc re, Confirmationi. Nam Confirmatio aliquando,* ex dispensatione, *confertur à simplici sacerdote: Ordines autem sacri, ac præsertim* Sacerdotium, *nunquam nisi ab Episcopis conferuntur.* See *Estius Sent.* 4. *dist.* 25. §. 1, 2. where he saith,——*Ordines minores authoritatee Romani Pontificis, qui in Universâ Hierarchiâ Ecclesiasticâ supremam habet potestatem, posse aliis committi, præterquam Episcopis: sed non majores; aut* saltem, non Sacerdotium. —— So *Escobar* in his summ of the Doctrine of the Jesuits. —*de Ordine cap.* 3. *Minister Ordinum Ordinarius solus Episcopus. Presbyteri Cardinales Ministri etiam sunt minorum Ordinum in suis Titulis, Majorum autem solus Presbyter potest Minister esse ex jure extraordinario Pontificis,* excepto Sacerdotio. Here you see the *Sacerdotium* exempted from the *jus extraordinarium Pontificis.* As for all the Orders below it, they seem of much less consequence, and therefore ‖ some Dispen-

‖ See Estius *in* 4. *d.* 5. *Sect.* 2.

Diſpenſations for the Miniſtration of them permitted to the Church.]

5ly. The Tenent of thoſe *Roman* Writers, whom they quote on their ſide, ſeemeth repugnant both to the Scriptures, as hath been ſhewed before §. 12.—— and §. 155. *n.* 7. and to the Doctrine of Antiquity, §. 52, &c: and is much cenſured by other learned men of that Church. —*Nequaquam Theologi* (ſaith one of them‖) *ſed Juriſtæ tandem inventi ſunt, qui primò ad lucem & notitiam hanc opinionem* (*ſi opinio ſit*) *protulerunt.* —— And, *Fundamentum hujus opinionis oritur ex gratiâ ſedis Apoſtolicæ: Major viz. ſupremæ illi ſedi gratia foret, veritatem indagare, & inventam declarare, quàm ſub fuco gratiæ illius ſedis, opiniones novellas antiquitati ignotas eructare, &c.* §. 183. *n.* 6. 5.

‖ *Franciſcus de Sancta Clara Apol. Epiſcop. c.* 5. p. 125.

See Soave *Hiſt. Trend.* 7 p. 735.

6. Laſtly, granting all that theſe Writers ſay, it ſecureth not at all the Presbyterian Practice; for Epiſcopal Ordination, ſtanding firm by theſe Writers Opinion, *jure Apoſtolico, & Eccleſiaſtico*, except where the *Pope* diſpenſeth, whoſe Diſpenſation, concerning any thing eſtabliſhed *jure Apoſtolico*, the Presbyterians have not, ſeek not, cannot procure: the Presbyterians therefore are ſtill obliged to the Obedience of this Law Apoſtolical; or, if this be an Eccleſiaſtical Law, it will oblige till the ſame Authority, which made, reverſe it. Nay further: ſeeing that the Presbyterians (I mean thoſe here in *England*) do hold, what is eſtabliſhed *jure Apoſtolico* to be perpetually binding, and unalterable, either by the *Pope*, or by the Church, and do therefore (chiefly, from the Writings of the Apoſtles, ſee before §. 82, 83.) urge, that the Presbyterian Government ought to be embraced, and the Epiſcopal removed, they can build upon no Author, that holds Epiſcopacy *jure Apoſtolico*, a thorow juſtification of their own Proceedings. §. 183. *n.* 7. 6.

To qq 1 All Functions of Sacred Orders, that are received at the ſame time, from the ſame Perſons, to the ſame effect, imprinting of a Character, &c, are not §. 184. R. to qq. 1.

equally incommunicable; for so is the Power of Baptizing, and Preaching, received by Priests, at the same time, from the same Persons, &c, with the Power of Consecrating the Eucharist, and reconciling Penitents; yet those may be delegated to non-Priests, these not:

2. see above §. 104. *n.* 1, 2. [2] There are many Reasons, why Confirmation, rather than Ordination, should be dispensable to Presbyters, which see before §. 67. Those Fathers, who approached neareſt in their expressions to the equalling of Bishops and Presbyters, *Jerome*, *Chrysostome*, do still except the one, not always the other. (see above §. 65. *n.* 9. *Quid, exceptâ Ordinatione?* — and

3. — *Solâ Ordinatione superiores.*) [3] It is an opinion also of many Learned Romanists, and one afterwards a *Pope*, that Confirmation is undispensable to Presbyters. See §. 68. *n.* 5.

§. 185. R. to rr. To rr. Of the several parts of Christ's Commission to his Apostles, some are communicable to the more inferior of Ecclesiastical Orders, some are not; Baptism, being a Person's first initiation into Christianity, and, as the most necessary, so the lowest step, and of the easiest, simple, and unerring Ministration, was delivered as so communicable. But not therefore, so all: as was said but now. Indeed Baptism is a kind of *anomalon*, and no fit Prescription for other Clergy-Offices, * Wherein the Minister may in some sense *dare quod non habet*; * where the effect wholly depends on the Sacrament, *i. e.* on the matter and words thereof rightly applied, not on the Authority, or Power of him who conferreth it at all; * which is valid and unalterable, when done, by any Person, without any Dispensation from a Superior, without any necessity at all of his doing it.

§. 186. R. to ss. To ss. Doth not a Deacon come nearer to a Presbyter, or Bishop, than a Woman, or Pagan, to a Deacon? Yet, a Pagan baptizing, it is valid; but a Deacon may not consecrate the Eucharist, absolve, confirm, or ordain, the Presbyterians being Judges. Nay: a Pagan may give that

that Character, which himſelf hath not, in baptizing; and yet a Deacon may not give that Character, which he hath; as, being confirmed, he may not confirm; ordained a Deacon, he may not ordain a Deacon; this latter, at leaſt; the Presbyterians being Judges.

To tt. [1] Holy Orders are not neceſſary to all Perſons, as Baptiſm is. [2] For whom they are convenient, the Church hath always ſufficient opportunity to demand them from the right, and appointed, Miniſters thereof‖: Of whoſe Orthodoxneſs or erroneouſneſs Inferiors ought not to judge, but to be directed, what is the one, or the other, by them. [3] If any Iſlanders, void of all Commerce, and Shipping, ſhould not have ſuch opportunity, they muſt be content to want Ordinations, till God's Providence ſhall offer them ſome Commerce. For, as *Blondel*, *Quæ neceſſitas major Dei voluntate*‖? Elſe, the ſame Suppoſition will ſecure even Lay-men to execute all Clerical Functions in an Iſland, or in a long Navigation, where they have no Clergy‖. And have not theſe Principles animated ſome to go on ſo far, as to ſay, that the People, in ſuch caſes, may not only exerciſe ſacred Functions, but alſo ordain to themſelves Prieſts? *Duplеſſis* (ſaith Mr. *Pryn* in his *Timothy unbiſhopt*, p. 81.) *De eccleſ.* c. 11. ——*Ames. Bell. enervat.* 2. *Tom.* l. 3. c. 2. *with ſundry others, affirm, that the People alone, in caſe of neceſſity, where there are no Biſhops, nor Miniſters, may lawfully ordain Miniſters, as well as baptize and preach. The right of Ordination being originally in the whole Church and People, miniſterially only in Biſhops and Presbyters, as Servants to the Congregation.* And ſee, what a hot Contention the *Engliſh* Presbyterians have with the Elders of New *England* about this matter, in *Jus Div. Min. Evang.* cap. 13. Thus Fancy (commonly called Reaſon), when once broken looſe from Authority, and from its Governors, runs forward it ſees not whither, and knows not where to ſtop it ſelf. But why do we not then ſay the ſame: *Quæ neceſſitas major Dei voluntate*, concerning;

§. 187. R. to tt.

‖ See above Sect. 67.

‖ See before Sect. 157.

‖ See above Sect. 158.

concerning Baptism by Lay-men; *Calvin* (*Instit.* l. 4. c. 15. §. 20, 22.) saith so. And so I think, do some Presbyterians. See *Jus Divin. Minist. Evang.* p. 21. and 112. And so should I: had I not learnt, from the Practice of the Church Catholick, that our Lord had indulged, in case of necessity, an extraordinary Minister thereof.

§. 188. R. *to* uu. To uu. [1] Neither are Presbyters granted to have an original Power of Ordination; [2] Neither can the *Pope* or *Church* dispense therein; [3] Neither, if they could dispense, have the Presbyterians obtained any such Dispensation, or sought it. [4] Neither, when they are restrained of this Power formerly, either by Apostolical, or Ecclesiastical Constitution, is there now, or hath there been heretofore (suppose, at the beginning of the Reformation) any case of necessity, for which they should resume it: as is shewed before §. 160, &c.

‖ See Sect. 157. Sect. 182. n. 2. &c.

§. 189. R. *to* ww. To ww. Let them not be afraid. All the Bishops in the World have not hitherto, never shall, fail; have not hitherto been (as themselves must confess), never shall be, all, Hereticks, and Persecutors of the good and Orthodox †. Suppose, they should, yet Ordination must be permitted to run still in the same Channel, wherein God hath placed it, till he shall remedy all; and not they put their hand to the Ark of the Church shaking, who are not in this manner licensed to do it *.

† See Sect. 162. See Sect. 160.

* See Sect. 187.

§. 190. R. *to* xx. To xx. If all the Bishops, both of East and West, and all their Clergy (excepting a very inconsiderable number) *i. e.* if the whole Catholick Church, as to the Governors and Teachers thereof, (who have our Saviour's promise of indefectibility,) at the beginning of the Reformation, opposed these Presbyterian Reformers, and refused to ordain them, (as seemeth to be here confessed): This is to be done. First, they must be content to remain unordained. — 2ly. They must reform those Faults, for which they are refused to be ordained: lest they be found to disobey, and resist, the only true Catholick

Catholick and Apoſtolick *Church*, acknowledged in their *Creed*.

To yy. Let it be granted; that, if in caſe of neceſſity ſuch Presbyter-Ordination is lawful, then alſo, without ſuch caſe of neceſſity, it (being done) is valid; But yet, thus, it followeth not; that, without ſuch neceſſity, it is lawfully done; and ſo, both the Ordainers, the Ordained, and who ſo ſerve themſelves of them, live in a Practice unlawful, and conſequently unbeneficial, to thoſe at leaſt, who know it to be unlawful. For no Sacerdotal Function whatever, is beneficial to their Salvation, who knowingly repair to ſuch, as unlawfully exerciſe it; they by this rendring themſelves guilty of Schiſm. §. 191. R. *to.* yy.

To zz[1]. Yes. Becauſe they were againſt the Canon of Scripture alſo; againſt the Inſtitution of our Saviour, and of his Apoſtles. But, if only againſt the Canons of Councils, are therefore the Presbyterians under no ſubjection to ſuch Canons? I ſuppoſe they are †. §. 192. R. *to* zz[1].

† See Sect. 177.

To zz[2]. *Void*, that is, fruſtrate, as to any exerciſe of that Eccleſiaſtical Office, which, though valid, yet was, illicitely, and contrary to the Church's Laws, conferred on them. —*Irritum dicitur, non ſemper quod invalidum eſt, ſed quo ordinatus nullo modo poteſt licitè uti.* —— Such words, *irritum*, *vanum*, *non valere*, are uſed ſometimes, where the Ordination is unqueſtionable, becauſe the Election is irregular. See *Conc. Antiochen.* c. 19. —*Euſeb.* l. 6. c. 42. §. 193. R. *to* zz[2].

CHAP. VI.

THis, minutely, to their ſeveral Objections. And, now that I have a little leiſure to look back, and reflect, in groſs, upon their whole Proceedings in this matter; methinks their behaviour — [But, before I go §. 194. Concluſion.

go further in a matter, that looks like censuring, and judging, which our Lord hath forbidden us, I desire, you would here understand me to speak, of no more than those Persons only, whose Writings I have here quoted; nor, of them, further, than their own words above cited will justifie me; neither charge I them, in such words, of evil Intentions, or of abetting any thing against their own judgment, but am willing to believe rather a neglect of better informing it, and this, rather from reading ill Authors and an unhappy Education, than from any corrupt interest, or affection]; Their behaviour, I say, toward their innocent Mother the Holy Catholick Church, and toward the chief Pastors, and their spiritual Fathers, therein, seems to me to have been both undutiful, and irrational, from this review thereof, which I shall here give you. They grant such Ecclesiastical Governors superior to Presbyters, as the Church now hath, to have been in the Apostle's times, and by their appointment; as *Timothy*, *Titus*, *James*, *Mark*; and call them *Governors extraordinary*†, and such, as were to have no Successors (I mean such as themselves, single Persons) in this Power. They meet with the like Governors, clearly, and frequently, expressed in the Epistles of S. *Ignatius* (not only in the former, but the late-found Copies that agree in every thing with the Originals, which are quoted by the Fathers) the like Governors, I say, to have been in his times, immediately following the Apostles; and they say, without any just reason, that these Writings are *supposititious*‖. —— They meet with the like Governors again, (as themselves confess *), spread over the Church about *A. D.* 140. and that is but some 40. years after the expiring of the last Apostle; and they say, that many Corruptions crept into the Church in the very Infancy thereof, and that stirrups then began to be made for Antichrist to mount into his Saddle *; and they seem not afraid to make the whole Catholick Church (as it were in a joint Conspiracy) so soon to disobey,

† See Sect. 85. n. 1.

‖ See Sect. 44. n. 2.

* See Sect. 75. n. 1.

* See Sect. 92.

diſobey, and ſwerve from, the Apoſtle's Orders, and that without the reſiſtance, or complaint, (in ſuch a quarrelſome point of admitting an uſurped Authority), of any one particular Church, or Perſon, that we hear of: and with the like confidence they condemn the undiſturbed Practice of the ſame Church ſince for 1400 years. They meet with *Aerius* condemned, for the like opinion, in the ancient Church a little after *A.D.*300: and ſome of them take courage and juſtifie him *: Others, not liking his ill name with Antiquity, avoid the being eſteemed his Followers on ſuch Pretences, as no way relieve them ‖. They quote, and embrace, S. *Jerom* as their ſingular Patron, for his making Biſhops and Presbyters equal; and preſently they turn backs, and forſake him again, for his declaring Epiſcopal Government, above Presbyters, both *lawful*, and for divers reaſons *neceſſary* ‖. They produce one ſingle Author, I know not what to call him, out of all Antiquity that mentioneth a prime Presbyter *, where the ſame Author in the ſame place declareth alſo this prime Presbyter to be a Biſhop †; A Biſhop, I ſay, in the modern Senſe; as having Power of Ordination, which the other Presbyters, this prime one excepted, (he ſaith) have not (ſee §.87. and 136.): And yet from his ſingle Teſtimony (for what I can obſerve) they will eſtabliſh, contrary to the witneſs of the reſt of Antiquity, and alſo contrary to this ſame Author himſelf, an ancient Form of Government of a prime Presbyter, ſhort of a Biſhop, preſiding in the ſeveral Presbyteries.

* See Sect. 93. n. 1, &c.

‖ See Sect. 155 n. 2.

‖ See Sect. 135

* See Sect. 76. n. 1. *and* Sect. 136.

† See Sect. 87.

Some of them, thinking they have proved, an equalized Presbytery, at the firſt [accotding to S. *Jerom*'s witneſs], to have managed Church-affairs throughout the Apoſtolical times, upon this will not allow the following Church any power to alter herein the primitive Apoſtolical Orders, and Practice *. But, on the contrary, others of them, when Epiſcopacy ſeemeth to be proved againſt them to have been of Apoſtolical Conſtitution, [ſee the Conteſt between Biſhop *Andrews* and

* Sect. 155. n. 5, &c.

P. du Moulin], do easily grant, the Apostolical Constitutions may be changed, and instance in many, that have been so: As, *abstaining from blood and things strangled*; *Deaconesses in the Church*; *Prophesying two or three at a time*, † &c. Some of them detrude Episcopacy, from *jus Divinum*, to *jus Apostolicum*; but, to *jus Apostolicum statutum suâ prudentiâ*, not *afflatu Divino* *. Others of them shove it a little lower from *Apostolical*, to *Ecclesiastical* Constitution †; And having once removed it hither, then they generallize it into *humane* Constitution *: and then they think it low enough for them to step over it; and to yield no obligation thereto; when they can shew some inconvenience therein. (For humane Constitutions may from time to time be varied, as men think fit). But retaining it in its better Terms, *Ecclesiastical Constitution*, yet they will confess no obligation to it *. [1] Though they can but stile themselves (at most) a Provincial, or National Church standing out against the Universal. [2] Though they are, in a National Church, only inferior Presbyters, standing out against their Superior Bishops. [3] Though only a small part of the Presbyters of a National Church, standing out against the rest, both Bishops and Presbyters. They charge great Errors, Corruptions, Persecutions of Truth, upon their former Ordainers; And they will themselves be the Judges thereof *. Lastly, That necessity may be the better pleaded for their Ordaining one another, it is urged, that all the Bishops of the whole Catholick Church opposed, and refused to ordain them *: Whereas they should rather have learnt from this, speedily to have amended those Faults, which they say rendred them not only uncapable of the Church's Preferments, but liable to her Censures. Humility and Obedience are the surest guards against Error.

† See Sect. 78.

* See Sect. 79. n. 2.

† Sect. 75. n. 2 and 87.

* See Sect. 155. n. 2, 3.

* See Sect. 94. n. 10.

* See Sect. 94. n. 15.

* See Sect. 94. n. 15.

§. 195. Now, with what measure these men have meted to others, from this which follows, I think I may, with modesty, pronounce, that it hath been measured to them

them again, by later Sects, ſprung here, ſince their quarrel with Epiſcopacy, out of their Bowels; (of whom themſelves complain, *Jus D.* part. 1. p. 64. *That when the Lord ſtirred up many in this Iſland to ſeek to ſerve the Lord with a pure worſhip*, [I ſuppoſe they mean a worſhip freed from Epiſcopacy], *and the work went forward with great felicity, theſe ſo alienated and imbittered the Spirits of Profeſſors, that the way of Truth* [I ſuppoſe they mean, the Government of Presbytery] *was every where evil ſpoken of.*). Which Sects have endeavoured to overthrow the Presbyterial Miniſtry and Diſcipline, as they had done formerly the Epiſcopal: which Sects do maintain *; *That there is no ſuch Office, as the Presbytery, inſtituted by Chriſt to be perpetual in his Church.* —— Who *cry down the Presbyterian Miniſtry, as Antichriſtian, and made by Antichriſtian Biſhops.* —— Who ſay, *that if there was a Miniſtry ordained by Chriſt, and continued in the Apoſtle's days, yet it was, ſince, loſt under Antichriſt* *. —— Who affirm, *that any one may do the work of the Miniſtry without Ordination.* —— Or *if any Ordination ought to be, that a company of believers aſſociated together, may ordain without Miniſters; and Impoſition of hands may be performed by ſome of the Brethren choſen by the Church thereunto* *. Laſtly, who ſay, *that it is the greateſt cheat that ever was put upon Chriſtians, to make them believe, that there is a diſtinct Office of the Miniſtry peculiar to ſome men and not to others*: which is called by them *a monopolizing of the Miniſtry, and the worſt of all monopolies* *: [All this you may find obſerved and lamented by the Presbyterian Aſſembly in their *Jus Divinum Miniſterii Anglicani* publiſhed 1654. after ſome time that this new Party had begun to overtop them (ſee there the *Epiſtle* and *Preface* and p. 45, 76, 95, &c. 183, 187, 190, 192.): Who therefore divide their Defence into two parts, and are conſtrained to ſpend more Paper to confute theſe new Adverſaries, than their former, the Biſhops.].

* See *Jus div. Miniſt. Evang. Epiſtle.*

* Ibid. p. 45.

* Ibid. p. 187. and *J. D. Miniſt. Angl.* c. 1.

* Ibid. Preface.

And theſe new Adverſaries ('tis obſervable) do, for the defence of their Opinions, manage againſt the Pres- §. 196. *n.* 1.

byterians the same Weapons, which these formerly used against Bishops, and shoot them back the Arrows taken out of their own Quiver; and, in the very same manner (as the others) do stand upon their Defence. When the Presbyterians urge against them the *Scriptures*, for such a sacred Ministry ordained with Imposition of hands by *Christ*, or by his *Apostles*, &c: These Answer them in their own Language ‖, *That such* Ministers *and such Ordinations were* extraordinary, *and temporary, for the first Plantation of the Gospel: and, that Imposition of hands was used by the Apostle, only for the present occasion, because that the Jews had their publick Officers thus set apart; as* Paul *also used Circumcision, &c. — and that it was used in a miraculous way, and did then confer the Holy Ghost, and the gift of Tongues, and therefore as the Miracle is ceased, so ought the Ceremony.*

‖ See *Jus div. minist. Evang.* p. 178. and p. 27. &c.

§. 196. *n.* 2. And then, in reply to these Anti-Ministers, the Presbyterians do urge * *Mat.*28.20. touching the Apostles, *I am always with you even unto the end of the world*, —and —* 1 *Tim.* 6. 14. touching *Timothy*, *Keep this Commandment until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ* —and, several other Texts concerning him, and *Titus*, cited before §. 121. *n.* 2. From which Texts it will follow; both, that the Apostles, and after them, *Timothy*, and *Titus*, were not extraordinary Ministers, but were to have Successors, in the Offices, they then managed: which Offices, (for several Functions thereof, that were always to continue in the Church, as, Ordination and Judicature) were, then, superior in them to the common Presbytery; and therefore (by these Texts which they urge) were still to continue so, till the end of the World, and till the re-appearing of Jesus. (of which see §. 121.) And then, why doth not the *Presbyterian* yield to the Bishop those Texts proving Succession of *Episcopacy* against him; whereof he maketh use to prove Succession of *Presbytery* against the *Fanatick*? ‖

‖ V. Sect. 73. n. 2.

§. 197. *n.* 1. Again; when, in the next place, the Presbyterians urge against them the *Fathers*, the Practice of Antiquity, and

and of all former Ages, in the behalf of the constant Succession of an ordained Ministery therein. These repay them in their own Coin, and tell them, *that Corruptions, and Antichristianism, and Tyranny came very early into the Church; that the Mystery, and Ministry of the Man of Sin was working in the first Centuries. —That in this Apostasie, the Church, which had been a chast Virgin, became the Mother of Harlots and Abominations.*—Bethel *turned into* Bethaven, *and the Ministry wholly lost under Antichrist* ‖. ‖ *See Jus Divin.* p. 45.

And then, in reply to these, the Presbyterian can speak out concerning the temerarious Imputations of *Antichristianism; That though the Apostasie under Antichrist is exceeding dreadful, and it is the duty of God's People to come out of* Babylon; *yet we need the Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation of Christ, that we may know the things that differ, and may not call good evil, and evil good, but, according to the Word of God, judge righteous judgment.*—*That the Truths, Ordinances, Servants, and Ministers of Christ do not therefore cease to be of Christ, because some, either by mistake, or by design, shall say, they are of Antichrist.*——*That Gold is Gold, whereever we find it, and that it is a vast comprehensive Error to reject all Tenents (though never so true) for Errors, because an erroneous Society doth confess them.*——*That some, who cry out Antichrist, Antichrist, yet do crucifie Christ again in his Members.*——*And that it is a great Cheat, that is now put upon the Saints of God in this Nation, in scaring People from the Doctrine of Christ, by perswading them to avoid Antichrist.*——*And therefore, that they earnestly intreat their respective Congregations not to be affrighted at the Bugbear word,* Antichristian, *or* Popish.——*Lastly; that, though some men running into extreams do brand some of the Ordinances of Christ with the black mark of Antichristian Ordinances; yet they hope better things of their People, and beseech them to take heed of those, who call Good Evil, and Evil Good, and that call the Institutions of Christ the Doctrines of Antichrist.* Thus they in *Jus Divinum* part. 1. chap. 3. and 10.——part. 2. chap. 3.——Let them accept § 197. *n.* 2.

accept of the like Answers, then, from the Church, when they make Episcopacy a Corruption of Antiquity, and a Stirrup for Antichrist to get into his Saddle.

§. 198. *n.* 1. Again; When the Presbyterian Ministers (now unexpectedly seeing every one to usurp the Sacred Functions, and to step into their Chairs without any Ordination at all, Episcopal, or Presbyterial; and every one to have a Doctrine, and an Interpretation, of his own), do begin to require, and call for their Obedience to their Spiritual Superiors, and to the Church's Authority and Discipline; These reply to them, what they first in part at least learnt from them; and, abstracting from all Church-Tradition, and Humane Comments, reduce them to the Naked *Bible*, and to the Infallible *Word* of God, and to the *Spirit*, and their own *Enthusiasms*. And from this *Word*, they make frequent Negative Arguments to elude the Church-Discipline, and those Sacred Orders and Ceremonies, which the Presbyterians also allow. See *Jus Divinum* part. 1. p. 177. *They tell them; there is no need of Ministers in the Gospel times, that the Saints shall all be taught of God.——And ye need not, that any man teach you.——And they shall not Teach every man His Brother, &c.——That they take too much upon them; and that, if not all, yet the gifted are as Sacred, as much Sent, and Authorized as they.——That all Gods People are Priests,* Revel. 1. 6. —— *That, as every one hath the Gift, so He ought to Minister,* 1 Pet. 4. 10.——*And that private Christians in the Apostles days, went every where preaching,* Act. 8. 4.—11. 19.

See *Jus Div.* part. 1. p. 35.

Ibid. Preface.

See *Jus Div.* part. 1. p 101, 110, 112.

§. 198. *n.* 2. And then, in Reply to these Scripturists, and Enthusiasts, the Presbyterians, in behalf of the Church, and her Officers, and the necessary Authority of these to expound and give the right sense of the Scriptures, for stopping the mouths of false Teachers, and for keeping men in the Unity of the Faith, do freely answer such things as these. They tell them, *That a Negative Argument from Scripture doth not hold in matters of such a Nature* [*i. e.* of Fact]; *that it doth not follow, because it is not Recorded,*

Recorded, therefore it was not done; and that many things are done which are not Written. *Jus Divinum* part. 1. p. 177. (If themſelves, therefore, uſe like Negative Arguments not unfrequently, in matter of Epiſcopacy, let them take the ſame Anſwer).——They tell them, *That* [notwithſtanding that we have the Scriptures], *yet the myſtery of Godlineſs is ſo great, that Fleſh and Blood doth not reveal it to us; and that there is a veil upon our Eyes in reading the Scriptures, which is not removed, nor the Saints inſtructed, ordinarily, without the Miniſtry; quoting* Jerem. 3. 14, 15. [I will give you Paſtors, which ſhall feed you with underſtanding]. *Ib.* p. 36. And (p. 31.) they tell them,——*That the Myſteries of the Goſpel are ſo high, ſo tranſcendent above Nature, that till the Faculties of the Soul be elevated, there is a Veil upon theſe Myſteries, without; and upon our Hearts, within; ſo that if the Queſtion were demanded of Us,* Underſtandeſt thou what thou Readeſt? *If we had the ſame Ingenuity, we ſhould return the* Eunuchs *Anſwer:* How can we, except ſome man guide Us? ——*Ibid.* (p. 39.) They tell them, ——*That the Miniſtry is* * *neceſſary* (*Epheſ.* 4. 11, 12, 13, 14.) For the perfecting of the Saints, that we be not Children toſſed to and fro and carried about with every wind of Doctrine by the ſleight of men, till we all come into the Unity of the Faith: *as likewiſe,* * *neceſſary* for ſtopping the Mouths of Gainſayers, who ſubvert whole Houſes, and teach things which they ought not, (Tit. 1. 11.) ——*Ib.* (p. 40.) *That Chriſt's promiſe of the continuance of ſuch a Miniſtry is no conditional Promiſe, depending upon ſomething in us, where the non-performance of ſome condition on our part, might excuſe the non-accompliſhment of the promiſe on God's part; but abſolute, and independent upon us, and therefore certainly hath not, ſhall not, be broken: and that, in the Apoſtaſie of Antichriſt, this Miniſtry ſhall not be loſt, &c.*——They tell them, *Ibid.* part. 2. p. 31, 34.——*That, no true Miniſtry, no true Church.*——*And, that the Lord Jeſus hath given the Miniſtry to the Church to continue,* till all come to the Unity of the Faith, *&c.* *Eph.* 4. 11, 12, *&c.* *Which will*

will never be, till the day of Judgment. That he hath promised to be with the Apostles teaching and baptizing, always even unto the end of the World. *Mat.* 28. 20. *which must needs be understood of them, and their Successors. That he hath promised,* That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church, *Mat.* 16. 18. (*i. e. the universal visible Church, existing in its particulars. That the Apostle* Paul *also saith; that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to be observed, and to continue till the* coming of Christ, 1 Cor. 11. 26. [And therefore a true Ministry shall be always: for none else (say they) may consecrate it*]. *That Christ's visible Kingdom shall abide to the end of the World,* Luke 1. 33.—Esay 9. 6, 7. *By all which Texts* (say they) *it is evident, that there was, is, and shall be, a true Ministry preserved by Jesus Christ even to the end of the World.* —*For how can the Sacrament be continued to the Church till Christ come, if there were so many hundred years in which there was no true Ministry? How can it be said, that Christ is with his Ministers always, &c, if, during all the Reign of Antichrist, there was no true Church-state in the World, no true Ordinance, as some say, no true Ministry? And therefore though we should not be able to tell, how the Church and Ministry was preserved in the midst of that great and general Apostasie, that hath been in the Christian World, yet notwithstanding we ought to believe, that it is so; because Christ hath said it shall be so: and Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but not one tittle of God's word shall pass away.* [Thus the Fanatick hath opened their mouth in behalf of the perpetuity, in all Ages, of a true and orthodox Clergy to guide, and govern Christ's Flock, to whom also this Flock is to repair for the Understanding of Gospel-Mysteries.] Lastly, against these men, they reckon up a Catalogue (*chap.* 3. *p.* 53.) of ordained orthodox Ministers, that have been constant Guides to the People, and supported the truth against false Teachers in all Ages since the sixth Century, leaving Bishop *Jewel*'s Challenge to justifie the Orthodoxness of the Ministers of the six former Ages.

* *Jus D. part.* 1. *p.* 184.

Well

Well then. *Ex ore ſuo.* Let them make good to the Epiſcopal Party, what they allow to the Fanatick. If themſelves will ſtand to the Sentence of this never-failing true Miniſtry, to which they adviſe others, there will ſoon be put an end to our preſent Controverſie. For who are this Miniſtry? Since themſelves confeſs, that there are many falſe Teachers and Seducers, therefore every one that is ordained, ſurely, is not this Miniſtry, to whom the Sheep are to obey, and to hear their Voice. Neither can a very ſmall and inconſiderable number of the Clergy (ſtrayed in their Opinions from all the reſt), be * the Miniſtry, which Chriſt hath left unto us for the ends, which the Presbyterians mention; viz. *that the Mouths of the falſe Teachers may be ſtopped by them; and that we ſhould not be toſſed with every wind of Doctrine; till we all come into the Unity of the Faith:* Nor, * the Miniſtry, which is to be followed and adhered to; when as both the former and preſent Fathers of the Church, the Biſhops Ancient and Modern, when as the Councils of the Church, when as the greateſt Body of the inferior Presbyters of the Church do all oppoſe them, and condemn them: Nay (to go ſomewhat further) when as none of that Catalogue, which themſelves have named, of orthodox Miniſters, from Century the Sixth to Century the Sixteenth, and to the times of *Luther* (ſave only if the *Waldenſes* had any Miniſters), nor none of the former Ages of the Church till Century the Sixth (ſave one, *Aerius*). Nor, ſince *Luther*'s time, none, that I know of, of all thoſe *Engliſh* Martyred Miniſters (which they mention) ſince the Reformation, can be ſhewed to have concurred in opinion with theſe few Miniſters, (who are departed from the reſt, and would have the People to follow them apart), in this matter of oppoſing Epiſcopacy, as it is ſuperior to Presbyters; I ſay; ſurely theſe men, that are ſo few, ſo late, ſo varying from the judgment of thoſe whom they call their Predeceſſors, can never reaſonably pretend themſelves to be the Miniſtry that is to be adhered to, by the Peo-

§. 199.

See *Jus Div.* p. 57, 58.

ple to keep them *from tossing* to and fro; and all the rest, present, past, that teach the People otherwise, to be the Ministry to be left and forsaken. For, if such may be followed, and the other rejected, we are still tossed among several winds of Doctrine, as well when having such a Ministery, (*i. e.* when these deliver diverse Doctrines, and all pretend, that they ought be followed,) as when not having it; and are no more reducible by them to any Unity of Faith, than we are without them, except in such Points, where no ordained Minister dissents from any other. If therefore the Fanatick follow the judgment of this great Body of the Church's Ministry (which, or else no Minister's judgment at all, is, in all reason, to guide us), then the Presbyterians cause is lost, as touching the Controversie of Episcopacy: Or, if the Fanatick be again committed, and left, to himself, to judge all by the Scriptures, then, as he himself misunderstands and misinterprets them, is the Presbyterial Ministry also lost. Thus in their grappling with these new Adversaries, either they lose their own Government, if the judgment of the Church be not to be stood to; or, if it be, they establish the Episcopal. *Justus est Dominus in Judiciis suis. In his Judgments just:* and in his Judgments, may not we say, merciful too? For, * who knows, whether thus we may not, by our punishment, reflect upon our fault, and the disobedience of others to us, soonest mind us of our disobedience to others; as *Joseph*'s Brethren, hardly used by the Governor of *Egypt*, called to mind their own hard usage of their Brother: * Who knows, whether the strange Extravagancies of Liberty multiplying into so many Sects, a *Cadmean* Progeny fighting with one another, be not the readiest way to teach men the necessity of Obedience; and, whilst they find no resting for their foot amongst the Floods and Waves of still changing new Polities Ecclesiastical, who knows, whether they may not the sooner return to the Ark of the Church, and her Ancient Government, from which they first departed, and sought a hurtful liberty?

liberty? *return* I ſay to their ſpiritual *Fathers*, the Biſhops, and to their Catholick Mother, the *Church*, and there prevent, and ſhelter themſelves from, thoſe Curſes, which from God hang over the Heads of diſobedient and rebellious Children: And ſo, *Miſericordiam & Judicium cantabimus Domino.* Amen.

F I N I S.